

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
FOR
THE YEAR 1911-1912

VOLUME V

EDITED BY
BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH
SUPERINTENDENT OF THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF IOWA



THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA
1912

COPYRIGHT 1912 BY
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

EDITOR'S PREFACE

This volume of the *Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association* covers the transactions of the Association from the close of the fourth annual meeting in 1911 to the close of the fifth annual meeting in 1912. During this period two meetings of the Association were held — one at Buffalo, New York, on December 28, 1911, and the other at Bloomington, Indiana, on May 23, 24, and 25, 1912. The regular mid-year meeting was held at Buffalo, New York, in connection with the regular annual meeting of the American Historical Association. The Bloomington meeting was the fifth annual meeting of the Association. Papers and addresses delivered at the mid-year meeting will be published by the American Historical Association, while those delivered at the fifth annual meeting are included in this volume. There was held in connection with the Bloomington meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association two joint sessions of the Teachers' Section of this Association and the History Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association. The papers read at these joint sessions are accordingly included in this volume.

A Report of the Committee on State History in Secondary Schools has come to the Editor. This Report includes (1) a syllabus of Kansas history by Mr. Raymond G. Taylor of Manhattan, Kansas; (2) a syllabus of Missouri history by Mr. E. M. Violette of Kirksville, Missouri; and (3) a syllabus of Ohio history by Mr. Frank P. Goodwin of Cincinnati, Ohio. In view of the fact that other syllabi are to be prepared later, it has been decided to postpone the publication of the Report until it is complete.

6 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

For assistance in preparing the copy for the printers, in reading the proofs, and in compiling the index, the editor is indebted to Miss Ethyl E. Martin, Secretary to the Superintendent of The State Historical Society of Iowa.

BENJ. F. SHAMBAUGH

THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

CONTENTS

CONSTITUTION	9
OFFICERS FOR 1911-1912	11
MEETINGS FOR 1911-1912	
DECEMBER MEETING	17
FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING	19
REPORT OF SECRETARY-TREASURER, MAY, 1912	31
PAPERS AND ADDRESSES	
THE SETTLEMENT OF THE JOHN RANDOLPH SLAVES IN OHIO	39
THE QUAKERS IN THE OLD NORTHWEST	60
THE WESTERN RESERVE IN THE ANTI-SLAVERY MOVE- MENT, 1840-1860	73
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY IN THE MOVEMENT FOR FIF- TY-FOUR FORTY OR FIGHT	99
FREEDOM OF TEACHING IN HISTORY	117
TEACHING HISTORY BY TYPE STUDIES	133
DISCUSSION	136
DE SOTO'S LINE OF MARCH FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF AN ETHNOLOGIST	147
THE DISINTEGRATION AND ORGANIZATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN IOWA, 1852-1860	158
ATTITUDE OF THE WESTERN WHIGS TOWARD THE CON- VENTION SYSTEM	167
FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERI- CAN EDUCATION BEFORE THE REVOLUTION	190

THE BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE	207
THE ART OF PRESENTATION IN HISTORY TEACHING	221
A PROPOSAL FOR THE FEDERATION OF HISTORY TEACHERS' ASSOCIATIONS	227
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE CERTIFICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS OF HISTORY . . .	233
DISCUSSION	238
INDEX	241

CONSTITUTION OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

I — NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

II — OBJECT

The object of the Association shall be to promote historical study and research and to secure coöperation between the historical societies and the departments of history of the Mississippi Valley.

III — MEMBERSHIP

Membership in this Association shall be divided into three classes, namely: active, sustaining, and life members. Any one interested in the study of Mississippi Valley history may become a member in any of these classes upon payment of the dues hereinafter provided.

IV — OFFICERS

The officers of the Association shall be a President, two Vice Presidents, and a Secretary-Treasurer, who with six other active members, and such ex-Presidents of the Association as retain their membership therein, shall constitute the Executive Committee.

All officers shall be elected at the annual meeting and shall hold office for one year or until their successors are elected and have qualified, providing, however, that at the first election held hereunder two members of the Executive Committee shall be elected for one year, two for two years, and two for three years, and that hereafter two

10 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

members of the Executive Committee shall be elected annually to hold office for three years.

The Executive Committee shall have general charge of the affairs of the Association including the calling of meetings and selection of papers to be read. Five members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

V — MEETINGS

A regular annual meeting and a mid-year meeting of the Association shall be held on such dates and at such places as the Executive Committee may determine.

VI — DUES

The annual dues for individual active members shall be one dollar. The annual dues for library members shall be two dollars. Sustaining members — either individuals or institutions — shall pay five dollars annually. Any individual may become a life member upon the payment of fifty dollars.

VII — AMENDMENTS

This Constitution may be amended at any regular meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at a previous meeting, or the proposed amendment having received the approval of the Executive Committee.

OFFICERS OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION FOR
THE YEAR 1911-1912

PRESIDENT

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, LL. B.
Professor of History, University of Chicago

FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

REUBEN G. THWAITES, LL. D.
*Secretary and Superintendent of the State Historical Society of
Wisconsin*

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

JAMES A. JAMES, Ph. D.
Professor of History, Northwestern University

SECRETARY-TREASURER

CLARENCE S. PAINE
Secretary of the Nebraska State Historical Society

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

In addition to above named officers

(EX-PRESIDENTS)

FRANCIS A. SAMPSON, LL. B.
Secretary of the State Historical Society of Missouri

THOMAS M. OWEN, A. M., LL. D.
*Director of the Department of Archives and History of the State
of Alabama*

CLARENCE W. ALVORD, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of History, University of Illinois

ORIN G. LIBBY, Ph. D.
Secretary of the State Historical Society of North Dakota

12 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH, A. M., Ph. D.
Superintendent of The State Historical Society of Iowa

(ELECTED)

ISAAC J. COX, Ph. D.
Professor of History, University of Cincinnati

GEORGE W. MARTIN, A. M.
Secretary of the Kansas State Historical Society

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, Ph. D.
Professor of History, Vanderbilt University

CLARENCE M. BURTON, A. M., LL. B.
President of Michigan Pioneer and Historical Association

GEORGE E. VINCENT, Ph. D.
President of University of Minnesota

JAMES A. WOODBURN, Ph. D.
Professor of American History, Indiana University

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE TEACHERS' SECTION
OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION FOR THE YEAR
1911-1912

CHAIRMAN

EDWARD C. PAGE, A. B.

Professor of History, State Normal School, DeKalb, Illinois

SECRETARY

HOWARD C. HILL, A. M.

Professor of History, State Normal School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

MEMBERS

LAURENCE M. LARSON, Ph. D.

Professor of History, University of Illinois

JOSEPHINE M. COX, A. M.

*Teacher of History, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis,
Indiana*

ALBERT H. SANFORD, A. M.

*Professor of History, State Normal School, LaCrosse,
Wisconsin*

ALICE E. WADSWORTH, B. L.

Teacher of History, Evanston High School, Evanston, Illinois



THE MEETINGS OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
1911-1912

9

THE MEETINGS OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION 1911-1912

DECEMBER MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION (Buffalo, New York, December 28, 1911)

REGULAR SESSION

The regular mid-year meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held at Buffalo, New York, on December 28, 1911, in connection with the annual meeting of the American Historical Association. Owing to a misunderstanding on the part of the committee in charge of the program, an invitation to unite in a joint session at the Buffalo meeting was not received until November. When advised of the custom established at Indianapolis in 1910, Mr. Charles H. Hull, Chairman of the Program Committee, spared no effort in arranging a program for a joint session which was creditable to both associations. The following papers, which are not included in the *Proceedings* of the Mississippi Valley Association but will be published by the American Historical Association, were read at the mid-year meeting: *The Insurgents of 1811* by Mr. D. R. Anderson of Richmond, Virginia; *The Quit Rent System in the American Colonies* by Mr. Beverley W. Bond, Jr., of Lafayette, Indiana; *The Tariff and Public Lands* by Mr. Raynor G. Wellington of Vermilion, South Dakota; and the *Origin of the Wilmot Proviso* by Mr. Clark E. Persinger of Lincoln, Nebraska. Owing to the unavoidable absence of the Secretary, Mr. Clarence S. Paine, the following report upon the Mississippi Valley

18 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Historical Association was presented by Mr. Clarence W. Alvord:

Four years ago, in October, 1907, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was called into life. The first meeting was held in Lincoln, Nebraska, and it was there determined to postpone until the annual meeting of the American Historical Association at Madison the final steps in the organization. After a very full and animated discussion at this latter place, the consensus of opinion was that the interests of the Mississippi Valley were sufficiently united and important to warrant the organization of a separate agency for the purpose of promoting the study of its history. Time seems to have justified these expectations, for the organization has appealed to varied classes within the great Valley; and there has never been a time when those who were most interested in its welfare had reason to be pessimistic concerning the final outcome.

At the last annual meeting certain changes in the constitution were made which placed the Association in better financial condition than it had been before. Its membership is now divided into the following classes: Life members, who pay \$50.00; sustaining members, who pay \$5.00 per annum; active members, who pay \$1.00 per annum; and library members, with annual dues of \$2.00. The appeal made by the Secretary for new members has resulted in fourteen life members, thirty-two sustaining members, and one hundred seventy-six library members. Of the active members, who pay but \$1.00 a year, there are four hundred thirty-two. Every effort should be made by those interested in the Association to secure new members, for the far-reaching plans of the Executive Committee will call for an increasing expenditure of money.

Up to the present time, the publishing activities of the Association have been confined to the printing of the *Proceedings*. This publication has been a credit to the Association, for on the whole the papers have been of good character. Three fairly good-sized volumes have been published, and a fourth is in the press. It has been fortunate that Mr. Benj. F. Shambaugh has been willing to devote his time to the editing of these volumes, for this has insured careful proof-reading and a dignified exterior.

The other publishing activities of the Association have been placed in the hands of a Publication Committee, who have planned a series of collections. There has been signed a contract with The Torch Press Company of Cedar Rapids, which will assume the financial responsibility of the publication and make a return to the Association. The manuscript of the first volume, which will consist of reprints of very rare pamphlets on proposed western colonies during the British régime, is about ready for the press, and it is expected that shortly after the next annual meeting this volume will be ready for distribution.

At the last annual meeting an arrangement was made with the North Central History Teachers' Association by which that organization was made a part of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

In closing, let me say that the burden of carrying on the business of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association has fallen upon the shoulders of the Secretary, Mr. Clarence S. Paine. It has been his duty to raise funds to print the *Proceedings* and he has frequently extended to the Association his personal credit. No one could have worked more indefatigably for the welfare of the Association in all its activities; and, if it has up to the present had a successful career, the greatest credit must be given to the Secretary, who has served so well and so long, and whose compensation will be found in the consciousness of a duty well performed.

FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

(Bloomington, Indiana, May 23, 24, and 25, 1912)

The fifth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held at Bloomington, Indiana, on May 23, 24, and 25, 1912; and in connection with it there was held a regular meeting of the History Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association. The program for the meeting was arranged by a committee consisting of Mr. James A. Woodburn, Mr. Harlow Lindley, and Mr. Frederic L. Paxson. Mr. Woodburn was also Chairman of the local Committee on Arrangements.

20 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

FIRST SESSION

The first session of the fifth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held on Thursday, May 23rd, at 2:00 o'clock, P. M., in the Auditorium of the Student Building of Indiana University, with Mr. Andrew C. McLaughlin presiding. The first paper of the session was by Mr. Henry Noble Sherwood of Cincinnati, Ohio, on the subject of *The Settlement of the John Randolph Slaves in Ohio*. This was followed by a paper on *The Quakers in the Old Northwest* by Mr. Harlow Lindley of Richmond, Indiana. The reading of a paper on *The Western Reserve in the Anti-Slavery Movement, 1840-1860*, by Mr. Karl F. Geiser of Oberlin, Ohio, was postponed owing to the absence of Mr. Geiser. The paper on *The Influence of the Mississippi Valley in the Movement for Fifty-Four Forty or Fight* by Mr. Daniel Wait Howe, President of the Indiana State Historical Society, was read by title.

With the conclusion of the regular program it was moved and seconded that the President be authorized to appoint the following committees of three members each: on Resolutions, on Nominations, and on Audit. The motion was carried. The appointments were as follows: on Resolutions, Mr. John E. Bradford, Miss Idress Head, and Mr. Benj. F. Shambaugh; on Nominations, Mr. Clarence W. Alvord, Miss Anna B. Silver, and Mr. E. F. Colburn; on Audit, Mr. Samuel B. Harding, Mr. Solon J. Buck, and Mr. Howard C. Hill.

SECOND SESSION

The second session was held in the Men's Gymnasium on Thursday, May 23rd, at 8:00 o'clock, P. M., with Mr. Daniel Wait Howe presiding. Mr. Howe introduced President William Lowe Bryan of Indiana University, who gave the address of welcome. The evening program was concluded with the President's address by Mr. An-

drew C. McLaughlin, whose subject was *The Supreme Court and Unconstitutional Legislation — Historical Origins*. At the close of the evening session, a reception was given to visitors in the Student Building.

THIRD SESSION

The third session was devoted to the Teachers' Section of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in joint meeting with the History Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association. This session was held on Friday, May 24th, at 9:30 o'clock, A. M., in the Auditorium of the Student Building. Owing to the absence of Mr. Edward C. Page, Chairman of the Teachers' Section, the meeting was presided over by the Secretary, Mr. Howard C. Hill.

The session opened with a paper by Miss Herriott Clare Palmer of Franklin, Indiana, on *Freedom of Teaching in History*. The next number on the program was a paper on *Teaching History by Type Studies* by Mr. Charles Alexander McMurry of DeKalb, Illinois. A *Discussion* of this paper was led by Mr. Henry T. Lukens of Chicago, Illinois.

At the close of the program a brief business session was held at which the following officers of the Teachers' Section were elected for the ensuing year: Chairman of the Executive Committee, Mr. Albert H. Sanford of La Crosse, Wisconsin; Secretary of the Executive Committee, Mr. Howard C. Hill of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; members of the Executive Committee for a term of three years, Mr. Karl F. Geiser of Oberlin, Ohio, and Mr. Dana C. Munro of Madison, Wisconsin.

A resolution offered by Mr. Samuel B. Harding of Indiana University to the effect that the Teachers' Section of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association should appoint one of its number to serve with persons appointed by the Indiana State Teachers' Association and the Ameri-

22 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

can Historical Association, respectively, for the purpose of furthering the federation of history teachers' associations was adopted unanimously.

At 12:30 o'clock, P. M., on Friday, a luncheon was given by the University of Indiana to the members of the visiting associations.

FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was held on Friday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock in the Auditorium of the Student Building. The session was opened with a paper by Mr. Orin G. Libby of Grand Forks, North Dakota, on *Our New Northwest*. Mr. Libby was followed by Mr. John R. Swanton of Washington, D. C., who read a paper dealing with *De Soto's Line of March from the Viewpoint of an Ethnologist*. The *Disintegration and Organization of Political Parties in Iowa, 1852-1860*, was the subject of a paper by Mr. Louis Pelzer of Iowa City, Iowa. The paper by Mr. Karl F. Geiser on *The Western Reserve in the Anti-Slavery Movement, 1840-1860*, was then read, after which the morning session was closed with a paper by Mr. Charles Manfred Thompson of Champaign, Illinois, on the *Attitude of the Western Whigs Toward the Convention System*.

FIFTH SESSION

The fifth session was held in the Auditorium of the Student Building on Friday, May 24th, at 8:00 o'clock, P. M., with President McLaughlin presiding. The program consisted of two papers: *Factors Influencing the Development of American Education Before the Revolution* by Mr. M. W. Jernegan of Chicago, Illinois; and *The Battle of Lake Erie* by Mr. Paul Leland Haworth of West Newton, Indiana.

The regular program was followed by a business session, which opened with the Report of the Secretary-Treasurer. A report of the Publication Committee, of-

ferred by Mr. Clarence W. Alvord, recommended the appointment of a committee to investigate and report upon the proposal to publish a "Quarterly Historical Review". Mr. Alvord stated that he had personally secured a guarantee fund amounting to \$500 a year for five years, and urged favorable consideration of the plan. On motion the report was accepted.

It was moved by Mr. Alvord that the President appoint a special committee of three members to consider the plan proposed by the Publication Committee, with instructions to report to the Executive Committee at a meeting to be held during the mid-year meeting at Boston in December, and that the Executive Committee be given power to act upon such report.

The Committee on Historic Sites submitted the following report:

Your committee beg leave to report progress. The organization of a La Salle Memorial Association, incorporated under the laws of Louisiana, is under consideration. Your committee can promise for the mid-year meeting the completion of this first step in the proposed plan for the erection of a monument to La Salle in the State of Louisiana.

On the general subject of the preservation and marking of historic sites much valuable information has been collected which will be incorporated in a forthcoming report.

Orin G. Libby, Chairman.

On motion the report was accepted and the Committee continued.

The report of the Committee on the Certification of High School Teachers of History was omitted for presentation at the meeting of the Teachers' Section on the following day.

The report of the Committee on Resolutions was presented as follows:

Your committee appointed for the purpose of drafting resolutions expressive of the sentiments of the members in attendance

24 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

upon the fifth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association would submit the following:

First. We desire to extend our sincere thanks to the authorities of Indiana University for the privilege of holding our meeting in such a pleasing environment, and for the kindly welcome and courteous treatment which have been accorded to us. In particular we would express our appreciation of the manner in which Professor James A. Woodburn and his committee have made the local arrangements for this meeting, and of courtesies extended by the Commercial Club of Bloomington.

Second. That we hereby express our appreciation of the presence of Mr. John R. Swanton of the American Bureau of Ethnology, and of the excellent paper read by him before the Association.

Third. That we extend our thanks to the local press, both student and city, for the publicity which they have given to the proceedings of the Association.

Fourth. That we deplore the loss sustained by the Association in the death of Mr. Ogden H. Fethers of Janesville, Wisconsin, Mr. David L. Kingsbury of St. Paul, Minnesota, and Mr. Peter A. Dey of Iowa City, Iowa.

Respectfully submitted,

J. E. Bradford

Idress Head

Benj. F. Shambaugh

On motion the report of the Committee on Resolutions was adopted.

Mr. Solon J. Buck reported that the Committee to audit the accounts of the Secretary-Treasurer had completed its work and had found the accounts correct with a cash balance as reported. Whereupon the report was adopted and the Committee discharged.

Mr. Clarence W. Alvord then submitted the report of the Committee on Nominations. The Committee recommended the election of the following officers for the ensuing year: for President, Mr. Reuben Gold Thwaites; for First Vice President, Mr. James A. James; for Second Vice President, Mr. Isaac J. Cox; for Secretary-

Treasurer, Mr. Clarence S. Paine; for members of the Executive Committee for a term of three years, Miss Idress Head and Mr. Clarence E. Carter.

On motion the report was adopted and the Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the members present for the nominees. The ballot being cast, the President declared the foregoing officers and members of the Executive Committee elected for the terms mentioned.

Mr. James A. Woodburn offered the following resolution, the same having received the approval of the Executive Committee:

On December 29, 1911, at its annual meeting in Buffalo the American Historical Association adopted the *History Teachers' Magazine* as an organ of the Association, appointed a committee to supervise and assist in the editorial management of the paper, and voted a subsidy for its maintenance. The editorial committee consists of Professor Henry John Johnson of the Teachers' College, Columbia University, Chairman; Professor F. M. Fling, of the University of Nebraska; Miss Blanche Hazard of the High School of Practical Arts, Boston, Massachusetts; Professor George C. Sellery, of the University of Wisconsin; Professor St. George L. Sioussat of Vanderbilt University; and Dr. James Sullivan of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, New York; while the managing editorship is to continue in the hands of Dr. A. E. McKinley.

This magazine is offered to members of this Association at \$1.00 a year, though the regular price is \$2.00. In view of these facts and in consideration of the distinctive merits of this organ, this Association desires to express its approval of the *History Teachers' Magazine* and to recommend it to its members — and especially to all teachers of history. We believe that under the editorial supervision and direction of Professor Johnson, Dr. McKinley, and their colleagues, this magazine will become a distinct force for true professionalism in the study and teaching of history; and this Association wishes to do what it can to promote its circulation and to extend its usefulness.

On motion of Mr. Woodburn the resolution was adopted.

SIXTH SESSION

The fifth annual meeting was concluded on Saturday, May 25th, with a joint session of the Teachers' Section of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the History Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association, held in the Auditorium of the Student Building. The session was called to order at 9:30 o'clock, A. M., by Mr. James A. Woodburn, President of the History Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association. The program was opened by a paper on *The Art of Presentation in Teaching History* by Mr. Joseph R. H. Moore of Indianapolis, Indiana. Then followed *A Proposal for the Federation of History Teachers' Associations* presented by Mr. Carl E. Pray of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. *The Report of the Committee on the Certification of High School Teachers of History* was, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee, read by Mr. Woodburn. The *Discussion* of this report was opened by Mr. Samuel B. Harding of Bloomington, Indiana.

The session was concluded by the election of officers of the History Section of the Indiana State Teachers' Association for the ensuing term, and the selection of Indianapolis as the next place of meeting.

SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(Auditorium, Student Building, Bloomington, Indiana, May 23, 1912)

Pursuant to call, a meeting of the Executive Committee was held at Bloomington, Indiana, on May 23rd. President Andrew C. McLaughlin called the Committee to order at 4:00 o'clock, P. M. There were present the following: Mr. Andrew C. McLaughlin, Mr. James A. Woodburn, Mr. Orin G. Libby, Mr. F. A. Sampson, and Mr. Clarence S. Paine.

After some discussion with reference to the local expenses of the Bloomington meeting, Mr. Woodburn

agreed that these expenses would be provided for by the local committee.

On motion of Mr. Sampson, seconded by Mr. Woodburn, the expenditures of the Secretary in securing new members were approved.

On motion Mr. Woodburn was authorized to draft resolutions, endorsing the *History Teachers' Magazine*, to be presented at the business meeting of the Association.

The Committee adjourned to meet at the close of the business session on Friday evening, May 24th.

SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(Auditorium, Student Building, Bloomington, Indiana, May 24, 1912)

At this session of the Executive Committee, presided over by the retiring President, Mr. Andrew C. McLaughlin, there were present the following: Mr. Andrew C. McLaughlin, Mr. Benj. F. Shambaugh, Mr. Clarence W. Alvord, Mr. Francis A. Sampson, Miss Idress Head, Mr. Clarence E. Carter, Mr. Orin G. Libby, Mr. James A. Woodburn, and the Secretary.

On motion it was agreed that future program committees should be instructed to limit the time for reading all papers, except the President's address, to twenty minutes.

On motion the retiring President was authorized to name immediately two members of a committee, of which he should be chairman, to plan a program for a joint session with the American Historical Association at its next annual meeting to be held in Boston.

A motion by Mr. Shambaugh to appropriate \$300 to be used by the Secretary in employing clerical assistance for the ensuing year was seconded and carried.

On motion it was decided that the annual meeting of the Association for 1913 should be held at Omaha, Nebraska, some time between April 1st and May 15th — the

28 MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

exact date to be determined by the Program Committee after conferring with the local Committee on Arrangements.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER
(May, 1912)

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

(May, 1912)

The minutes of the last annual meeting held at Evanston, Illinois, May 18, 19, and 20, 1911, have been published in Volume IV of the *Proceedings*, which has been delivered to all members entitled to receive it. The most important feature of the Evanston meeting was the consolidation there effected between the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the North Central History Teachers' Association. That this union of forces will operate to the advantage of individual members of both organizations can not be doubted.

Another important step taken at the Evanston meeting was the adoption of an amendment to the constitution providing for life membership with a fee of fifty dollars, sustaining membership with an annual fee of five dollars, and library membership with an annual fee of two dollars. Under this amendment we have enrolled during the past year seventeen life members, forty-seven sustaining members, and one hundred and ninety-five library members.

Not until November of last year did we receive an invitation from the Committee on Program of the American Historical Association to unite in a joint session at the Buffalo meeting. This was due to a misunderstanding on the part of the Committee; and it should be said to the credit of Mr. Charles H. Hull, the Chairman of that Committee, that when advised of the custom established at Indianapolis in 1910, he spared no effort to arrange a program for a joint session which was creditable to both associations. At this session, which was held on Thursday, December 28th, papers were read by Mr. D. R. Anderson of Richmond, Indiana, Mr. Beverley W. Bond, Jr.,

of Lafayette, Indiana, Mr. Raynor G. Wellington of Vermilion, South Dakota, and Mr. Clark E. Persinger of Lincoln, Nebraska.

Owing to the unavoidable absence of the Secretary, the report of the Mississippi Valley Association was presented by Mr. Clarence W. Alvord of the University of Illinois. Programs of the Buffalo meeting were sent to all members of the Mississippi Valley Association at the expense of the American Association.

Immediately following the Evanston meeting, upon the suggestion of the President, a vote of the members of the Executive Committee was taken by mail on the question of a place of meeting for 1912, resulting in the choice of Bloomington, Indiana. The vote stood as follows: Bloomington, nine; Minneapolis, three; Des Moines, three.

Early in the year President McLaughlin named the Committee on Program for the fifth annual meeting as follows: Mr. James A. Woodburn, Mr. Harlow Lindley, and Mr. Frederic L. Paxson. This Committee is responsible for the excellent program arranged for this meeting, and Mr. Woodburn has been in charge of all local arrangements.

Upon the authority of the last annual meeting, President McLaughlin appointed as a Committee on Certification of High School Teachers the following: Mr. Frederic L. Paxson, Mr. James A. Woodburn, Mr. Frank M. Anderson, Mr. Orin G. Libby, Mr. Carl Christophelsmeier, Mr. Evarts B. Greene, Mr. Claude H. Van Tyne, Mr. Guernsey Jones, Mr. Frank L. Hodder, Mr. Jonas Viles, Mr. John Hugh Reynolds, Mr. Franklin L. Riley, Mr. John W. Townsend, Mr. St. George L. Sioussat, Mr. William C. Wilcox, and Mr. Eugene C. Barker. Mr. Van Tyne was later obliged to resign and was succeeded by Mr. Earle W. Dow, while Mr. Laurence M. Larson became a member of the Committee in place of Mr. Evarts

B. Greene. Later Mr. James F. Willard was added to the Committee. This Committee, through its chairman, Mr. Paxson, filed with the Secretary a preliminary report on December 28, 1911.

Mr. Eugene M. Violette of Kirksville, Missouri, and Mr. Raymond G. Taylor of Manhattan, Kansas, were appointed by the President to fill vacancies in the Committee on the Study of State History in Secondary Schools. With these additions the committees remain as they were last year.

Early in the present year an invitation was received from Mr. William O. Hart and Mr. William Beer, representatives of the Committee on Arrangements for the Louisiana Centennial Celebration, asking the Mississippi Valley Historical Association to hold a special meeting in New Orleans on April 30, 1912. The Secretary, after corresponding with members of the Executive Committee, advised the New Orleans Committee that the time was too short to permit of the preparation of a creditable program.

Volume IV of the *Proceedings* was issued from the press in February, 1912. This is a volume of three hundred and sixteen pages, containing the papers and addresses presented at the Indianapolis and Evanston meetings. The publishing activities of the Association have thus far been limited to the printing of the *Proceedings*. It is proposed, however, to issue a series of collections and reprints, contract for the printing of which has already been entered into with The Torch Press of Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The first of these volumes which will consist of reprints of very rare pamphlets on proposed western colonies during the British régime, is nearly ready for the press. This work is in the hands of the Publication Committee, of which Mr. Clarence W. Alvord is chairman.

It has been suggested that the Association undertake

the publication of a "Quarterly Review", under the supervision of an editorial board to be named by the Executive Committee. A plan for financing such a publication will doubtless be presented at this meeting.

Your Secretary, in submitting his first annual report on June 23, 1908, showed total receipts of \$80.00 with expenditures of \$76.69. Less than five years have elapsed since that time, and it is interesting to note that the present report shows receipts of \$1,750.35 and expenditures of \$1,645.65, with a total enrollment of eight hundred and five — representing a gain of two hundred and seventy-four members for the year.

We should not of course strive merely for numbers; but, being entirely dependent upon membership dues for our financial support, we must feel a certain degree of satisfaction in this evidence of popular interest, while we point with pride to the enrollment of the foremost teachers and students of history and to the high character of the papers presented at our meetings.

A special effort should be made during the coming year to increase the number of sustaining and library members. With annual dues of \$1.00 for individual members, every such membership is a liability instead of an asset. This will be true until we have a much larger enrollment than at present, unless we should lower the standard of our published *Proceedings* — a policy which is not to be considered.

For the next year the total income of the Association should be approximately \$2,000 and may be conservatively estimated at \$1,500. This, however, will depend very largely upon the amount of time which the officers are able to give to the work of spreading information concerning the Association and its purposes.

Invitations have been received from several cities which desire to entertain the next annual meeting. In addition to the standing invitations which we have from

Minneapolis, Des Moines, and Lincoln, the convention bureaus of Omaha, St. Louis, and Chicago, supported by public officials, civic societies, and educational institutions, offer the hospitalities of these cities and agree to pay all of the expenses of the meeting.

The following deaths of members have been reported to the Secretary since the last annual meeting: Mr. Peter A. Dey of Iowa City, Iowa; Mr. David L. Kingsbury of St. Paul, Minnesota; and Mr. Ogden H. Fethers of Janesville, Wisconsin.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Receipts

Cash receipts from membership dues and sale of publications from May 20, 1911, to May 20, 1912, per list attached and made part of this report	\$1657.78
Balance on hand May 20, 1911	97.57
	<hr/>
Total receipts	\$1755.35

Disbursements

Disbursements to May 20, 1912, per vouchers attached and made part of this report:

Printing Volumes III and IV of <i>Proceedings</i>	\$ 834.85
Postage and express	335.39
Clerical work	274.00
Freight and drayage	11.71
Printing stationery and circulars	66.70
Secretary's expenses	115.45
Miscellaneous	7.55
	<hr/>
Total disbursements	\$1645.65
Balance on hand	\$ 109.70

Respectfully submitted,

C. S. PAINE, Secretary-Treasurer



PAPERS AND ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE
FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MISSIS-
SIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION

(Bloomington, Indiana, May 23, 24, 25, 1912)



THE SETTLEMENT OF THE JOHN RANDOLPH SLAVES IN OHIO

BY HENRY NOBLE SHERWOOD

In our history no question has produced such general agitation or called forth such bitter feelings as that of slavery. It has been the issue in presidential elections, in the admission of States into the Union, and in the sessions of constitutional conventions. It has received attention from our greatest statesmen and political leaders, whose convictions on the subject were so set and so unyielding that in compromise alone was progress made — and in concession, peace. The negro in bondage was, as these facts show, a source of trouble to both statesmen and politicians; but his brother in freedom was almost as great a problem. The North stood for freedom and yet hesitated about receiving free negroes; the South stood for slavery, and therefore refused to give freedmen a home. What was to become of the negro who was already free or who might become free at the death of his owner? This was another phase of the negro question that had to be solved by those who realized the seriousness of the situation. And it was this phase of the question that the master of Roanoke tried to answer.

Among American statesmen who have expressed themselves on slavery, there was one whose character was so unique and whose method was so unusual that history fails to supply a parallel with which to compare him. As the owner of a large number of slaves and a citizen of the "sovereign and independent" State of Virginia, we would naturally expect John Randolph, at every turn, to ally himself with the advocates of the extension of slavery and the slave power. But the owner of the vast es-

tate of Roanoke had an observation keen enough to discern the unsubstantial economic foundation of slavery and to recognize that it was the most expensive labor in the world;¹ and if on some occasions he cast his vote in the interest of the slave power it was not because he cared less for the cause of emancipation but because the principle of State sovereignty was always uppermost in his mind. Universal and immediate emancipation which would mean the disruption of his State's economic basis he would therefore oppose; but as a good master he would do what lay in his power to alleviate the black's condition. And this resolve, made early in his life, was carried out in his will and led to the attempted settlement of his slaves in Ohio.

Randolph's desire touching these was clearly set forth in his will of 1821, which read:

I give and bequeath to all my slaves their freedom, heartily regretting that I have ever been the owner of one.

I give to my executor a sum not exceeding \$8,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, to transport and settle said slaves to and in some other State or Territory of the United States, giving to all above the age of forty not less than ten acres of land each.²

This will was supplemented by codicils, in which, in addition to the sum already stated, three thousand pounds were bequeathed to the executor as a fund for carrying into execution the provision respecting the slaves,³ and valuable lands in Virginia were to be used as a fund to improve the condition of the emancipated blacks.⁴

A previous will made in 1819 agreed in its main outlines with this one; but a subsequent will made in 1832, the year before his decease, revoked the provisions of the will of 1821. This last will ordered the sale of his slaves and the distribution of them among his heirs-at-law and

¹ Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, p. 208.

² Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, p. 150.

³ Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, p. 151.

⁴ Leigh's *Reports*, Vol. X, pp. 655-663.

next of kin.⁵ These conflicting provisions as well as the singular temperament of the testator gave rise to a series of legal proceedings in order to establish a will, and after thirteen years of litigation a decision was rendered by a special Court of Appeals establishing the will of 1821.⁶ During this time the slaves were kept in bondage and hired out by Judge Leigh, the executor, for which services performed by them the executor received an annual stipend, the amount of which is not in evidence. In 1845, however, preparations were begun for the removal of the slaves although the decision of the Virginia Court was not rendered until the following year.

The selection of a place for the colonization of these manumitted slaves had been easily decided. The lord of Roanoke, consistent with his opposition to colonization in Africa, had prescribed a free State or Territory within the United States, and the task of Judge Leigh, the executor of the will, was, therefore, reduced to a choice from a well known area. In selecting Ohio he was no doubt influenced by the fact that several settlements of freed slaves were already located in the State. In 1819 several hundred manumitted slaves had located in Brown County;⁷ later Lawrence County⁸ had received a colony; in like manner slave settlements had been made in Jefferson, Harrison,⁹ Stark,¹⁰ and Shelby¹¹ counties. Most of these colonies had been formed by slaves emancipated by the will of a deceased slaveholder, as in the case of the Randolph slaves. Naturally, therefore, Judge Leigh looked to Ohio for the future home of the slaves of Roanoke. But the question that arises is, why did he select

⁵ See *Niles' Register*, August 1, 1835.

⁶ For the main facts in the contest see Leigh's *Reports*, Vol. X, pp. 655-663; also 1 Grattan 18.

⁷ *Ohio House Journal*, 1859, Appendix, p. 60.

⁸ Mumford's *Virginia's Attitude Toward Secession*, p. 68.

⁹ Information supplied to the writer by Clarence A. Powell.

¹⁰ *Proceedings of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Convention*, 1835, p. 17.

¹¹ Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. II, p. 595.

Mercer County in preference to any other county in the State? The answer to this query is doubtless found in the provisions made in Mercer County for free negroes. Here Augustus Wattles of Connecticut had purchased in 1835 one hundred and ninety acres of land on which to erect a training school for blacks; and under his direction the negroes, who were largely from Cincinnati, had purchased land to the amount of about thirty thousand acres. This school Wattles had maintained at his own expense till 1842 when, through the handsome legacy of Samuel Emlen of New Jersey, it received \$20,000 whereby its name was at once changed to that of Emlen Institute, in memory of its most generous benefactor.¹² Therefore, when Judge Leigh began to look for a place for his charges, he instinctively selected land in the vicinity of the institution where training in the mechanical arts and agriculture was most available.

Accordingly, as soon as the will was established, preparations were begun to remove the manumitted slaves to Ohio. First, the statute respecting manumitted slaves had to be satisfied. A list of the negroes and mulattoes with a description of each was presented to the Clerk of the Court of Charlotte County, who duly recorded it in the "Book of Register of Free Negroes and Mulattoes". Interesting, and in many cases amusing, were some of these records. For example, the first entry was for one Frank Brown, whose description reads as follows: "dark complection, five feet, 11, $\frac{5}{8}$ inches high, 25 years 1 month old, small scar on forehead, whittish appearance on hands."¹³ Another for Willis, son of Queen, "dark, 5 feet 7, 22 yrs. old, wart on middle of fore finger, left hand." This list of entries continued until the number 596 was reached. And from the fact that 215 was Frank Brown we may infer that the number who

¹² Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. II, p. 241.

¹³ *Piqua Daily Call* (Ohio), April 16, 1901.

emigrated to Ohio was 381. Some of the negroes, perhaps a little doubtful of the fact of their freedom, or fearing their inability to maintain it, asked for copies of their manumission papers. The method of securing these papers can be illustrated by the case of one Nathan, who chose for his surname Jones. His papers read as follows:

Registered 30th., April 1846, and approved by the Court 4th May A. D. 1846, Number 269 Nathan, a man of brown complexion age 27 yrs., five ft. 6 in. high. He was emancipated by the will of Jno Randolph of Roanoke, as recorded in the General Court of Va. State of Va. Charlotte County to-wit:

I, Winslow Robinson, Clerk of the County Court of Charlotte County, State of Virginia, aforesaid do hereby certify that the foregoing registration is a true copy from the Record Book of Registers of free negroes and mulattoes in my office.

Given under my hand and seal of my office this 14th., May one thousand eight hundred and forty six.

Winslow Robinson, Clerk ¹⁴

While Judge Leigh was in Ohio securing the purchase of 3200 acres of land preparations were being rushed forward for the exodus from Roanoke. Sixteen wagons were loaded with tents and food-stuff for the long journey. Tom Cardwell, a noted negro driver, had been chosen to lead these children of bondage to the promised land. On June 10, 1846, after having paid their respects to the memory of their quondam master, the cavalcade, consisting of wagons drawn by four horses (although there was one wagon drawn by six), set forth on their journey to their future home in Ohio. Soon, however, they forgot their sad leave-taking and struck up a negro melody, a song of deliverance.¹⁵

Tradition has it that their route lay past Lynchburg, across the valley of Virginia and through the mountains into West Virginia to Union; thence due north to the

¹⁴ *Piqua Daily Call* (Ohio), April 16, 1901.

¹⁵ Albert G. Evans in *New England Magazine*, New Series, Vol. V, pp. 444, 445.

Greenbrier River, over the Hawk's Nest, around the fall of the Kanawha and down this river to the Ohio at Point Pleasant.¹⁶ It was a tiresome journey and many of the children were too young to walk and had, therefore, to be carried, while those who were more fortunate than the rest had secured horses, and had much for which to be thankful. Their first camping place was at the Natural Bridge. After resting here for a short time, they again resumed their journey, which save for an occasional fight between the teamsters, was barren of excitement, with perhaps one exception.

Soon after camping one evening, while the Aunt Dinahs were getting the supper ready, the men of the party discovered two foundations a few rods from one another near the camp. A foundation consisted of four logs arranged in the form of a square and signified the determination of a settler to take up his claim and build a cabin on the spot. This discovery led to a closer examination, in which it was found that one foundation contained a bloody shirt, an old rusty axe, and a knife. This information soon passed around the camp in subdued whispers, fear seized every soul, and great was the rejoicing when morning came and the party was once more on its way. But it was generally held to be a bad omen and to indicate an unhappy termination of the exodus.¹⁷

Nothing of moment occurred during the remainder of the march, but their fears were again aroused when they began the journey by boat. They embarked on the steamer "Ohio", but since it was too small to accommodate them they were transferred to the "Old Kentucky". They had not made a very long distance when the steamer caught on a bar, an event that frightened the negroes

¹⁶ Information secured from the descendants of the slaves for the writer by Clarence A. Powell. Mr. Evans, in the *New England Magazine*, says that they took the boat at Charleston on the Kanawha.

¹⁷ *New England Magazine*, New Series, Vol. V, p. 445.

more than the remnants of battle at the foundation. Many fell on their knees and called on the Lord to take them straight to heaven. Instead Judge Leigh took them to the Kentucky shore where they waited the rescue of the vessel, and, having re-embarked, they steamed down the Ohio. Within a fortnight after this ill omen they were in Cincinnati.

But the journey was not over. Mercer County lay almost a hundred miles to the north. They could not avail themselves of our present day steam and electric cars to complete the journey; but they could use the slow, clumsy boats on the Miami Canal — a canal for which the people of Ohio had spent their savings in order to make traffic less difficult and tardy, but by no means for the construction of a highway to facilitate the immigration of free negroes into the State.

It was on Wednesday morning, July first, that the negroes made their way from the river wharf to the canal. Up Main Street they came — all ages, sizes and complexions — giving the Cincinnatians a spectacle long to be remembered. One of the city reporters described it as a "singular scene — one which never before occurred here, and may never occur again. In front of our office and occupying the center of the street for half a square, was a crowd of negroes, men, women and children, like a drove of sheep coming to market. They were dressed in coarse cottons, apparently comfortable in bodily circumstances, and walked along from the river to the canal".¹⁸ In the reporter's judgment they had a more comfortable appearance by far than the North Carolina emigrants who had come to Ohio. Upon reaching the canal they entered the boats awaiting them, and began the remainder of their journey. As they moved along dressed in the garb of "Old Dominion" they continued to draw considerable attention from the lookers-on, who greeted them with a

¹⁸ *Cincinnati Daily Chronicle*, July 1, 1846.

"Hurrah for Old Virginny".¹⁹ On July 4th, these independence seekers reached Bremen, then in Mercer County, the canal port nearest to their land.²⁰ The dangers of their journey had been passed, and the poor blacks thought that now at last they could rest in the land of freedom which their good master had provided for them. But in this hope they were doomed to disappointment. The inhabitants of the County were opposed to the residence of the negroes in their neighborhood, and the reception they received was anything but hospitable. Captain Saville of the Canal packet, Banner, writing July 7th, on the subject remarks:

As we expected the emancipated slaves of John Randolph met with a warm reception upon their arrival at Bremen, that being the nearest point upon the canal to their land. I found on my way North that the news of their coming had spread through the whole country, and a general feeling was manifested to prevent their landing by citizens of Mercer County. The boats containing these people laid over at Troy on Friday night, and on Sunday morning arrived at their journey's end. The citizens of surrounding counties were duly upon the spot. They, however, allowed them to land, but called a meeting whereupon resolutions were passed giving notice to agents that they would be given till 10 o'clock on the 6th., to depart. They succeeded in getting them aboard the boats again at 12 o'clock noon, and carried them back twenty miles and camped in the woods. No violence was used, all appeared to be done in a peaceful manner, yet the citizens of Mercer County are determined not to allow them to stay. A guard was placed around them till their departure.²¹

This was only the beginning of their troubles. They remained in the woods near Lockport only a short time. A further retreat took them to Piqua, Miami County, on the 11th, where they remained for at least five days,²²

¹⁹ *Cincinnati Morning Herald*, July 2, 1846.

²⁰ *Toledo Blade*, July 10, 1846. Captain Saville gives July 5th as the date of arrival.

²¹ *Western Christian Advocate*, July 7, 1846.

²² *Cincinnati Morning Herald*, July 11 and 17, 1846.

camping on the farm of the celebrated Indian agent, Colonel John Johnston.²³ Judge Leigh thought the opposition to the settlement was not general, and that further resistance would not be offered. So, having given security that the emancipated slaves would not become a charge upon the Township, he announced his decision to return to Mercer County.²⁴ He was mistaken, however, in this judgment, and proceeded no further than Sidney. Van Buren Township, in the northwest part of the County, already had a large well behaved negro colony,²⁵ and Judge Leigh resolved to locate the settlement here. Accordingly, land was bought near the existing black settlement, but a second time the whites resisted the immigration of the quondam slaves.²⁶

The benevolent and humane guardian²⁷ was in a quandary. Twice he sought legitimately to settle the manumitted slaves in Ohio, and twice the local resistance had thwarted his purpose. To take them back to Virginia would reduce them to slavery, and defeat the terms of the will of the orator of Charlotte. There was one place where they would be gladly received, and in going there Ohio would bid them Godspeed: that was Liberia, Africa, which had just taken hold of the reins of government. But John Randolph had specified a free State or Territory of the United States, and Liberia was out of the question, while to settle them as a community in Ohio was also impossible. Now began a distribution of the negroes — here a few, and there a few — in Miami and Shelby counties wherever employment could be found for them, and where the inhabitants did not oppose the presence of a few blacks. Promises to remove them in a year or so to

²³ *Cincinnati Gazette* (quoting the *Sidney Aurora*), July 15, 1846.

²⁴ *Cincinnati Morning Herald*, July 11, 1846; and *Cincinnati Gazette*, July 11, 1846.

²⁵ *History of Van Wert and Mercer Counties*, p. 479.

²⁶ *Cincinnati Gazette* (quoting the *Troy Times*), August 1, 1846.

²⁷ *Cincinnati Gazette* (quoting the *Troy Times*), August 1, 1846.

Liberia also served to pacify the people. Thus the community was scattered, families were often separated, and a second Acadia was enacted. Only a very few settled in Mercer County. These were located at Montezuma in Franklin Township.²⁸ The larger portion remained in Piqua, Sidney, Troy, Ludlow Falls, and the surrounding neighborhood. Some found homes in Pittsburg, Chicago, and various parts of Indiana, Mississippi, Louisiana, and California.²⁹ A very few returned to Virginia, the most noted being the old slave John, who had been so constantly at his master's side during his life, and who had been present during his dying hour.³⁰ He went with the determination of petitioning the legislature of Virginia to allow him to remain in the State a free man; if denied, he was resolved to submit to the penalty of being sold as a slave.³¹ In view of the reception and final disposition of the colony, the exaggerated statement of a late writer to the effect that they were driven out of the State by Abolitionists becomes erroneous.³²

Judge Leigh had completed his task by the middle of August, but the inhabitants of Mercer County had not lost their hostile feeling toward the newcomers. The presence of a colony of negroes in their midst since 1835 had been a constant irritation to the body politic, and they determined to have no further increase, and to rid themselves of the already too large settlement. A meeting, therefore, was held at New Bremen on August 15, 1846,

²⁸ Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. II, p. 242; and *Cincinnati Gazette* (quoting the *Troy Tribune*), August 1, 1846. The attorneys in the suit now pending in Mercer County assert that none of the slaves settled in the County.

²⁹ W. E. Henderson to the writer, May 3, 1912.

³⁰ Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, Ch. 44.

³¹ *Toledo Blade* (citing the *Lynchburg Virginian*), October 9, 1846. See also *Cincinnati Gazette* (citing the *Troy Tribune*), August 1, 1846. Three sons refused to accompany their father for they had sweethearts among the colonists. Consult *Report of the American Colonization Society*, Vol. XXX, pp. 10, 11.

³² Jacobs's *The Free Negro in Maryland*, p. 17.

“to take into consideration the best and most suitable measures for the removal of the entire colored population from the County, and prevent others from settling there”. Travis Mueller presided at the meeting, and John T. Ferguson acted as Secretary. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the negroes and mulattoes residing in Mercer County came into the County in opposition to a well known law of the State, and contrary to the wishes of the white population, and still remain here, contrary to law and to our wishes, and, therefore, have no claim on our sympathies.

Resolved, That the blacks of this County be and are hereby respectfully requested to leave the County on or before the first day of March, 1849. In case of their neglect or refusal to comply with this request, we pledge ourselves to remove them peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.

Resolved, That we will not live among negroes. As we have settled here first we have fully determined that we will resist the settlement of blacks and mulattoes in this County to the full extent of our means, the bayonet not excepted.

Resolved, that we who are here assembled pledge ourselves not to employ or trade with any black or mulatto person in any manner whatever, or permit them to have any grinding done at our mills after 1st., day of January next.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting the laws of the State, commonly called Black Laws ought not to be repealed, but should be so changed as to absolutely prevent for all time to come the emigration into this State of any black or mulatto persons whatever, and to carry out this principle we pledge ourselves not to vote for any officer who is not in favor of the enactment of such laws that will effectually prohibit the emigration of such persons into our State.

Whereas, the Supreme Ruler of the Universe has fixed his immutable laws for the government of the world, and marked his lines and boundaries and made undeniable distinction everywhere perceivable between the different races of man, therefore,

Resolved, that we will use all and every means in our power to preserve inviolate those laws and distinctions ordained by the Creator and hand them down unimpaired to posterity.

Resolved, That we view with shame and disgust the disgraceful attempt of the Anti-Republican portion of our American citizens to fasten disgrace upon the laboring class of this country by means of this miscalled philanthropy.

Resolved, that political abolitionism as it has shown itself in our National councils deserves an everlasting execration of all honest men, and the individual among us, who adheres to such sentiment shall be held in contempt and scorn.³³

It is obvious that the spirit of these resolutions was by no means pacific. In them we see the echo of the action taken by Mercer County citizens upon the immediate arrival of the John Randolph slaves. Captain Savi-ville's letter which we quoted was a most conservative exposition of their activity when viewed in the light of newspaper description. These are punctuated with such expressions as "recent outbreak",³⁴ "forcibly prevented",³⁵ "prevented by a mob",³⁶ "excitement to drive these negroes away"³⁷ — expressions which show that the resolutions of August 15 were not only the echo, but the earlier feeling fully matured.

The law-abiding citizens became alarmed. The threat, contained in the resolutions, to use the boycott, to expel by force, to use the bayonet, savored of mobbish disorder and violent race war. Therefore, reports were sent to the Governor setting forth the threatened disturbance, and on August 31st the following proclamation was issued from the State Executive Office:

³³ *Cincinnati Gazette*, September 5, 1846. See also *Report of the American Colonization Society*, Vol. XXX, p. 10, note.

³⁴ *Cincinnati Gazette*, July 15, 1846.

³⁵ *Cincinnati Gazette*, July 11, 1846.

³⁶ *Cincinnati Gazette* (citing the *Troy Times*), August 1, 1846.

³⁷ *Cincinnati Gazette* (citing *Piqua Register*), August 24, 1846.

PROCLAMATION

Executive Office, Columbus, Ohio,
August 31, 1846

Information having been filed in this office setting forth that persons have associated together with the intent to perpetrate within the County of Mercer, State of Ohio, acts of violence against peaceable and unoffending class of individuals, therefore, for the purpose of having the laws faithfully executed to preserve the peace and dignity of the State, and protect lives and property of those who are, or may be assailed, I, Mordecai Bartley, Governor of State of Ohio, do hereby call upon all Judges, Justices of the Peace, Sheriffs, and all other ministerial officers of said County of Mercer, to execute the laws in such case made and provided as faithful conservators of the peace and thus protect persons and property and State from insult and contumely, and relieve the State authorities of the unpleasant duty of resorting to more summary measures for the restoration of peace in the State, and justice to individuals within said County. It is presumed that the deep interest which the Judicial and Ministerial officers as well as peaceable and law abiding citizens of Mercer County will feel in preserving peace within their borders, and doing justice to all parties concerned, will induce them to cooperate in so desirable an object. If the colored people against whom the excitement has been raised have violated any law or disturbed the peace of the State, or trespassed upon the rights of others the legal remedy should be applied, but not unlawful violence used.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and
affix

Mordecai Bartley,
Governor of Ohio ³⁸

This timely action by the Chief Executive of Ohio was successful in the restoration of order. No further forcible attempts to expel the colored population of the County are observed. It is worth notice, however, that opposition to the immigration of colored people into Ohio was not restricted to Mercer County alone, but was general throughout the State. This attitude was as old as

³⁸ *Cincinnati Gazette*, September 5, 1846.

the Constitution of the State, which was framed in perfect disregard of the free negro.

A further evidence of the feeling was manifested in the passing of the "Black Law" legislation,³⁹ which was not entirely repealed until 1887. The conviction back of this attitude was that the existence of a colored population was unwise in the State; that the free blacks were ignorant, degraded, and vicious, contributing ten times as many prisoners as the whites to the penitentiaries and debasing the morals of the community.⁴⁰ In addition to this consideration, it was alleged that the commercial relations between the border States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio would be broken off if runaway slaves were permitted to immigrate hither.⁴¹

So strong were Ohio's convictions in this regard that an effort was made to deport all negroes from the State. A society for the purpose existed in the State as early as 1818, and in a short time there were a hundred such organizations supported by some of the noted men in Ohio. And when the John Randolph slaves were brought to Ohio a determined effort was made to secure a law entirely prohibiting the colonization of colored people in the State. The effort was defeated by the Abolitionists, who since the organization of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society in 1835 had gathered a large following.

The general traditional attitude of Ohio towards the negro might have led Judge Leigh to choose a different location for the emancipated slaves, in spite of the seemingly favorable condition in Mercer County, had it not been that the "Black Laws" had never been seriously enforced, and that the deportation movement was then on the decline. The executor possibly considered every phase of the situation save one, which proved to be the

³⁹ *Statutes of Ohio*, 1841, pp. 591-594.

⁴⁰ *Ohio House Journal*, 1835, Report of Judiciary Committee, p. 789; *Ohio Senate Journal*; Thirty-third General Assembly, pp. 446-450.

⁴¹ *Ohio Senate Journal*, Forty-fourth General Assembly, pp. 476 ff.

direct cause of his failure and the source of many subsequent troubles. This was the German Colony at New Bremen which in the Civil War times gave such warm support to Vallandigham.

This spot was selected in 1832 by a committee of Cincinnati Germans as a suitable location for a German Colony. The choice was a happy one and soon settlers came in fairly large numbers to make it their home. It was called Bremen, in deference to the old Bremen of their fatherland, but soon the Colony changed the name to New Bremen.⁴² The settlers who came from Cincinnati, where the free negro formed a large element in the population, were familiar with the problems arising from the presence of free negroes and were determined to make it impossible for their settlement to suffer on account of them.

They were in Cincinnati when the "Black Laws" were enforced in 1829, and were witnesses of the exodus of two thousand of them for their Canadian home. When these Cincinnati Germans were joined at New Bremen by others lately come over,⁴³ no doubt they instructed the newcomers in certain branches of social science. The whole Colony therefore realized the disadvantages resulting from the presence of free blacks; they saw property deteriorate in value, free white labor menaced, morals contaminated — in a word their standard of civilization endangered. None wished to repeat their Cincinnati experience. The black settlement in Shelby County and Emlen Institute were already too close to their borders. Judge Leigh's money did not have purchasing power adequate to overcome their objections to the settlement of the John Randolph slaves in their midst. These citizens of Mercer County, however, yielded for the moment to the temptation, sold their lands and received the money for

⁴² Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. I, p. 305. Bremen was in Mercer County previous to the formation of Auglaize in 1848. — Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. I, p. 293.

⁴³ *Toledo Blade*, July 10, 1846.

them, agreed to construct homes for the reception of the emancipated slaves, and to provide food for them upon their arrival. In this action they did not escape the merited criticism of their neighbors. One writes that "they should have made their objection before the land was purchased, and not waited till they had drawn the last cent of the blacks they could exact, and then raise an armed force and refuse to let them take possession of lands. We look on the whole proceedings as outrageous in the extreme and the participators should be punished severely. Those loudest in opposition, in the threats to shoot, etc., sold them the land, received wages for construction of buildings and for provisions for the blacks not two weeks before".⁴⁴

This condemnation is weak when viewed in the light of the present proceedings in the Court of Mercer County, Ohio, where an effort is being made to obtain for the descendants of the slaves of John Randolph the lands which Judge Leigh bought for them. It is pointed out in one of the briefs filed with the Clerk of the Court that on the 26th of October, 1846, without the order of the Court, Judge Leigh executed a Power of Attorney to one Joseph Plunkett as follows:

Know all men by these presents, that I, William Leigh of the State of Virginia, executor of John Randolph, deceased, do hereby constitute and appoint Joseph Plunkett, of the County of Mercer, and State of Ohio, my attorney for me, and in my name, to bargain, sell and convey, in fee simple, for such price and upon such terms of credit and to such persons as he shall think fit, the whole or any part of the lands purchased by me, as executor aforesaid, situate in said County of Mercer and State of Ohio, hereby certifying and confirming all such bargains. Receipts for purchase money, agreements and deeds as shall be made, executed or acknowledged in the premises by my said attorney, the same as if I were personally present and did the same.

The petition also recites that Plunkett disposed of

⁴⁴ *Cincinnati Gazette* (citing *Sidney Aurora*), July 15, 1846. See also *Cincinnati Morning Herald*, July 17, 1846.

the land which the Executor bought for the slaves to parties who were cognizant of the terms of the will of Randolph and of all the facts concerning the execution of it.

On these statements rests the charge that Judge Leigh, the Executor of the will, the friend and associate of John Randolph of Roanoke, did unlawfully and fraudulently for the purpose of cheating and defrauding said slaves and their heirs, transfer said trust to parties equally guilty with him.

That the land was purchased for the colored people the records testify, and that they failed to secure possession of them is equally well authenticated. Moreover, it appears that no attempt was made to recover lands until after a lapse of forty-three years. The explanation of this long delay is found in the ignorance which characterized the beneficiaries of the will. They knew nothing save to serve and obey the master of Roanoke and his overseers. Among them only one appears conspicuous, and this was due to his excellent behavior and pious life, not on account of his intellectual activities. He was Ned Lee who lived in Rossville, Darke County, and whose marriage in 1852 was a great social event among the Randolphs. The unique thing about Uncle Ned was his practice of oiling his face on Sunday, for he believed that "the Lord liked to have him make his face to shine".⁴⁵

Little more can be said for the two hundred descendants now in Ohio. The most prominent of them are Goodrich Giles and Nero Randolph of Piqua, and Isham Randolph, the brother of Nero, of Dayton. These men are good citizens and own their own homes. Mr. Giles owns a farm of 425 acres just out of Piqua well equipped with stock and implements, and he is said to be worth about fifty thousand dollars.⁴⁶

The hand of time is ever busy adjusting difficulties

⁴⁵ *Piqua Daily Call* (Ohio), January 28 and 30, 1908.

⁴⁶ Booker T. Washington's *The Story of the Negro*, Vol. I, p. 236.

and rectifying mistakes; and after the lapse of a half century, forces are at work to satisfy the claims of John Randolph's slaves — an event which promises as wide publicity as did their settlement, which was noted by the press in Washington and New Orleans.⁴⁷

The movement was begun by a chance remark dropped by a farmer living near Cold Water, Ohio, near which the land in controversy is located, to a young man named Bean, who is now dead. Mr. Bean had formerly been a student in the Indiana Law School and had desk room in the law office of W. E. Henderson of Indianapolis, one of the attorneys in the suit now pending. Bean told Henderson that the farmer said that the lands in and about Cold Water belong to the Randolph slaves, and if they had any sense they would get it. This aroused the interest of Mr. Henderson who at once directed an examination of the records of Ohio and Virginia, and at a sort of family reunion of the descendants of the slaves in 1909 an organization was set on foot to investigate the claims to the Mercer County lands.⁴⁸ In the meantime, on the 26th of May, 1905, a demand was made on the parties now in possession of the land to surrender and account for the rents and profits thereon. This they refused to do, and their continued refusal has called forth the suit now pending in Mercer County.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ *National Intelligencer*, July 16, 1846; *New Orleans Commercial Times*, July 10, 1846, in *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, Vol. XI, p. 143.

⁴⁸ W. E. Henderson to the writer, May 3, 1912.

⁴⁹ In view of the difficulties connected with the settlement of the John Randolph slaves in Ohio and the present litigation growing out of the affair, another method of colonizing free negroes in this State is worthy of consideration. The following plan is described in the words of Rev. B. T. Kavanaugh, an Ohioan, but a native of Virginia, and its simplicity when compared with the way of Randolph is obvious. Said Kavanaugh: "I can put you upon a plan by which you can get rid of them, and get them into Ohio very easy. Do you take them to Wheeling and there place them on a steamboat for Cincinnati, and speak of taking them to New Orleans; and while you are looking out for another boat, give them chance, and the Abolitionists will steal the whole of them, and run them off, and then cele-

The prominence of John Randolph in the affairs of Virginia and in the national councils of our country, and the method by which he emancipated his slaves, necessarily relegates to the province of this paper another consideration, namely, his attitude on the slave question. The owner of Roanoke had no conviction on this subject strong enough to drive him into a crusade for or against the maintenance of the institution. He belonged to the old group of men like Jefferson, who wanted to see slavery abolished but realized the difficulty of dealing with the question. Randolph thought that it was a problem for the State to solve without the interference of the national government, and doubtless believed that if it was left to itself a gradual voluntary system of emancipation would grow up. While negroes were slaves a fair day's wage should be required of them so as to make it possible for the master to provide for them in sickness and old age.⁵⁰

This *amis des noirs*,⁵¹ as he called himself, was opposed to the agitation of the subject, since he believed that it retarded the disposition to emancipate. In this connection, just after the debate on the Missouri Compromise, he said: "I am persuaded that the cause of humanity to these unfortunates has been put back a century, certainly a generation by the unprincipled conduct of ambitious men, availing themselves of a good as well as a fanatical spirit in the nation".⁵² It was his opposition to the agitation of the subject that furnished one reason for his withdrawal from the American Colonization Society, an organization for the purpose of deporting the free blacks of the United States to Africa. He was

brate a perfect triumph over them. But if you take them to the same men and ask them to receive and take care of them, they will tell you to take care of them yourself."—*Report of the American Colonization Society*, Vol. XXX, pp. 10, 11, note.

⁵⁰ Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, pp. 265-267.

⁵¹ Adams's *Randolph*, p. 21.

⁵² Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, p. 133.

present at the formation of this Society, took part in the deliberations, and was a member of the committee that drew up a memorial asking Congressional aid in the execution of the project.⁵³ Ten years later he was opposed to African colonization and refused even to present to Congress a memorial in its behalf, although urged to do so by his friend, Francis Scott Key.⁵⁴ Earlier he had pointed out that colonization would not affect the question of slavery as many of its advocates asserted, but that it would tend to secure the property of every master in the United States.⁵⁵ Since Randolph was a slaveholder, the opponents of the colonization movement seized upon his statement as conclusive evidence that the design of the Society was to rivet slavery still more firmly on the nation.⁵⁶ This furnished a second reason for his withdrawal from the Society. Nevertheless he did not do so until the impracticability of the movement was obviously manifest.⁵⁷ The forces which moved Randolph to liberate his slaves did not originate with the American Colonization Society but from the influence of an early environment. He spent five years in the Quaker city of Philadelphia where he came in contact with Benezet and his disciples.⁵⁸ Moreover he was familiar with the philosophy of the eve of the French Revolution which his contemporary, Thomas Jefferson, so devoutly cherished and which his own brother Richard put in practice by emancipating his slaves and colonizing them on Israel Hill, Virginia.⁵⁹ In addition to these considerations, Randolph

⁵³ Proceedings of the meeting, manuscript collection of the American Colonization Society.

⁵⁴ Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, pp. 265-267.

⁵⁵ *Report of the American Colonization Society*, Vol. 82, p. 7.

⁵⁶ Walker's *Appeal*, p. 57.

⁵⁷ Garland's *Randolph*, Vol. II, pp. 266, 267.

⁵⁸ Adams's *Randolph*, p. 20.

⁵⁹ *DeBow's Magazine*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 28 ff. See also *Virginia Historical Society Collections*, Vol. VI, pp. 19, 20. From the Greene County, Ohio, Record, it appears that these manumitted slaves were later colonized

was thoroughly convinced of the unsound economic basis of slavery. On this phase of the question he is reported to have said: "The hogs of Virginia eat all the corn, and the niggers eat all the hogs, and the day would come when the slave would advertise for runaway masters".⁶⁰ Thus Randolph was opposed to slavery and like the early fathers favored the cause of voluntary emancipation. He would have liberated his slaves many years earlier had not English trustees held his estate for debt until 1810 and the laws of his State placed such obstacles on emancipation.

around Xenia. W. E. Henderson of Indianapolis upon investigation found that about \$5,000 was due their descendants, but he could not locate any of them.

⁶⁰ *Ohio House Journal*, 1859, Appendix, p. 60.

THE QUAKERS IN THE OLD NORTHWEST

BY HARLOW LINDLEY

Pennsylvania was one of the last of the English Colonies formed in America. The favorable terms offered by William Penn caused such a rapid immigration to the Colony that the parts near Philadelphia were soon occupied and there was a demand for fresh lands, which resulted in the expansion of the Colony to the southwest away from the coast, as the lands near the coast were already settled. By 1725 the settlements of Friends had passed the Susquehanna River westward and were well on their way to the Potomac southward.

About 1730, a company composed principally of Friends, with Alexander Ross and James Wright at the head of it, secured a grant from the government of Virginia of one hundred thousand acres of land in the valley of the Shenandoah River. This brought about a rapid immigration to that region, the settlers being largely Friends. The leading community appears to have been Hopewell, five miles north of Winchester in Frederick County, Virginia, which was well established by 1735. Soon after the settlement was made around Winchester, other Friends settled in Loudoun and Fairfax counties, about forty miles east of Winchester.

Both of these settlements now became centers of immigration further to the south producing a chain of meetings across Virginia and well into the Carolinas. The trouble with the Indians in Virginia during the French and Indian War hastened the immigration southward where the Indians on the border were more peaceable, and thus the Friends settlements already begun were strengthened in the interior of North Carolina, partic-

ularly those of New Garden in Guilford County and Cane Creek in Orange County, which had their origin about 1750.

The immigration continuing southward entered South Carolina soon after 1760, and in a few years large and prosperous settlements of Friends were formed in Union and Newberry counties, South Carolina, and in Columbia County, Georgia. These northern immigrants were also joined by some families that came direct from England and Ireland. These settlements, made by the immigrants from the Northern Colonies in the Carolinas and Georgia, mark what may be called the replanting of Quakerism in the South, and it is from these communities to a large extent that the migrations to the Northwest were made.

With these brief statements with reference to the settlement of the Quakers in the South, we pass to the causes which induced them to leave their homes and migrate to the Northwest. Their location in the Southland was very desirable and pleasant as far as outward comfort and ease were concerned. We are told that no finer body of land could be found in South Carolina than that embraced within their limits in that State. Their communities were prosperous, their meetings were harmonious and pleasant, and there was a loving fellowship among them as brethren of the same household of faith. But as the eighteenth century grew to a close, there was unrest among them and a general feeling that a change of location was desirable. When these Friends were moving into the Southern provinces because of the balmy climate and fertile land, they perhaps little thought that the very institution which was produced and fostered by such conditions would be the cause of their deserting their homes and friends and starting life again in a new country.

At a time when human slavery seemed to be the nat-

ural order of events, when the advancement of civilization itself seemed to depend upon it, the Society of Friends appealed to the universal consciences of mankind and stood as opponents of the system of slavery. Friends at first, in common with others, held slaves to some extent, but there was all the time a protest against the practice as inconsistent with the Christian profession. When they located in South Carolina and Georgia, slavery was still tolerated among them, but in the years of their residence there the Society had taken a very advanced position on the subject. It can easily be seen that the change of sentiment had been gradual and a result of heartfelt conviction. One by one it was laid upon their hearts and consciences that it was wrong to hold their fellowmen in bondage, and they freed their slaves. This conviction spread and soon became the concern of the whole Society. By persistent persuasion the Society as a body became united on the subject. This pronounced stand of course put them in opposition to the prevailing sentiment of the country. Migration to the Northwest began in 1795 and by 1800 there were six Friends settlements in Ohio — three in Ross County, two in Warren County, and one in Lawrence County.

In 1799 the migration from South Carolina began. The Census of 1800 shows that in the preceding decade the slaves of Newberry County increased twenty-five per cent, while the white population was stationary. This showed the Friends the disadvantage to which their free labor would soon be put in competition with slave labor. In 1803, a Friends minister named Zachariah Dicks passed through South Carolina visiting the Bush River meeting and the Wrightsboro, Georgia, meeting. He was thought to have the gift of prophecy. He warned Friends to come out of slavery. At Wrightsboro he told the Friends of a terrible internecine war not far in the future, during which many men would flee to the mountains and

call on the mountains to hide them. He said the child was then born that would see it. He also advised them to leave Wrightsboro, which they did. This was forty-eight years before the predicted war came. At Bush River he went into particulars and depicted the silence and loneliness that would attend the house in which he was then speaking after its abandonment by those who had erected it and said that herbage would ere long grow in its now well beaten paths. These statements¹ were preceded by "O Bush River! Bush River! how hath thy beauty faded away and gloomy darkness eclipsed thy day!"

Zachariah Dicks's visit no doubt had a bearing upon the removal of Friends to the Northwest. The first to remove after this occurrence was John Jay, in 1803, soon after Dicks's visit; and by 1807 the Quaker settlement in Newberry amounted to only eleven heads of families. Judge O'Neal of South Carolina says:² "Newberry thus lost from a foolish panic and a superstitious fear of an institution which never harmed them or any other party a very valuable portion of its white population."

But other causes operated as well, for, while the exodus was particularly marked among Friends, yet others were moving in the same direction at the same time. The Appalachian Mountains had long been looked upon as a barrier against savage invasion on the one hand, and as one against removing to an unexplored and unknown wilderness on the other, but recent events had very materially changed the situation. In 1775 Daniel Boone, who by the way was a Quaker, crossed the mountains through the Cumberland Gap, and later, over the "Wilderness Road" thus opened, passed many of the pioneers of the Southern Colonies.

The settlement of the Quakers in the Northwest was

¹ O'Neal's *Annals of Newberry*, p. 330.

² O'Neal's *Annals of Newberry*, p. 35.

a part of the westward movement of population seeking more freedom or better economic opportunities. This new Northwest Territory then being opened to settlers, with its fundamental Ordinance dedicating it forever to freedom and free institutions, proved to be the land which would fulfil the vision of these Southern Friends. And they were not disobedient to the vision opened before them, but came with great rapidity as a vanguard to a mighty host that soon followed. The South Carolina Friends came first to Miami County, Ohio, and found some Friends from Guilford County, North Carolina, who had come the year before. The Miami Monthly Meeting, the first Friends business meeting established in the Northwest Territory, was opened in 1803. For the next four years the names of all Friends located in western Ohio and eastern Indiana who brought removal certificates are given in the records of the Miami Monthly Meeting. The dates of issues of these certificates and by what meeting issued are also given. The number of such certificates issued in the four years, 1803-1807, is four hundred, transferring the membership of 1826 persons to that meeting. These certificates came from forty monthly meetings, representing four yearly meetings.

From the one monthly meeting in Georgia there came twenty-eight certificates for one hundred and fifty-five persons; from the two monthly meetings in South Carolina there came one hundred and forty-three certificates for six hundred and fifty-five persons, making one hundred and ten persons from this section of the South, or about four-ninths of the whole number. From eleven monthly meetings in North Carolina, there came ninety certificates for three hundred and eighty-seven persons; and from two monthly meetings in Tennessee there came forty-five certificates for two hundred and twenty-one persons, making in these four years three hundred and six certificates from sixteen monthly meetings belonging

to North Carolina Yearly Meeting for one thousand four hundred and eighteen members, or seven-ninths of the whole emigration. Of the remaining two-ninths, or four hundred and eight persons, two hundred and sixty-nine were from Virginia; twenty-five were from Maryland; forty-five were from Pennsylvania; and sixty-nine were from New Jersey. Some of the new meetings established in Ohio were practically the old meetings of the South transferred to Northern soil.

Friends who had moved westward from the Ohio settlements or who had come direct from North Carolina and Virginia were among the first settlers in the eastern part of Indiana, and very early in the century North Carolina Friends commenced to make settlements in southern and western Indiana.

In North Carolina an ex-post-facto law, enacted in 1777, re-enslaved black persons who had been set free by their masters without conforming to certain forms not required at the time that the emancipations were made. North Carolina's claim to Tennessee was also ceded to the general government of the United States in 1789 with the proviso "that always no regulation made or to be made by Congress shall tend to emancipate slaves."

This occurred after Congress had excluded slavery from all the territory northwest of the Ohio River. With this start, Tennessee came into the Union in 1796 with a pro-slavery constitution. In 1799 Kentucky adopted a new constitution confirming slavery after a warm and thorough discussion. The establishment of slavery in Tennessee and Kentucky destroyed all hope that either State would afford pleasant abiding places, although Friends had located in both of them. The hold that the blight had now obtained was too firm to justify any hope for change. Hence the anti-slavery people in these States, and indeed in the entire South, saw that there was no resting place for them until they reached the country

beyond the Ohio River, where the foundation for the future local governments prescribed that there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude otherwise than in punishment for crime. The Ordinance of 1787 was in itself an important influence in bringing people to the Northwest. The immigrant to this Territory knew beforehand that this was a land of the highest political as well as national promise. He knew what society, laws, rights, privileges, and opportunities the future would bring.

The early Quaker settlers in Virginia and the Carolinas had taken the lead in the struggle for toleration during the first half of the eighteenth century as the Presbyterians did in the second half. They had become the largest organized body of dissenters in these Southern Colonies and were persecuted in Virginia and disenfranchised in the Carolinas. In North Carolina they struggled not only for religious but also for political rights. Their residence in North Carolina was also often made unpleasant during and after the Revolutionary War. Their thrift no less than their non-resistance made their property the prey of the British tax-gatherers before the War and of marauders of both parties during the War. After the War their anti-slavery sentiments made their surroundings uncomfortable to people of their feelings, while the existence of the "peculiar institution" rendered unfavorable the prospects of persons of the non-slaveholding class, especially such persons as must depend upon their own labor for their livelihood and advancement in life. At the same time in which the Quakers, under the influence of the preaching and writings of John Woolman, Benjamin Lay, Anthony Benezet and others, had rapidly advanced to a decided anti-slavery position, the upholders of slavery in North Carolina had taken every favorable opportunity to strengthen the system of human bondage. A petition to Congress in 1797 showed that one hundred and thirty-four black persons

set free by Quakers were again reduced to servitude under the authority of this *ex post facto* law already alluded to.

Their activity and opposition to slavery brought upon the Quakers both at home and in the debates in Congress the bitter abuse of the advocates of the doctrine of "property in man". For their own feelings and for the welfare of their children many determined to leave the South. Thus a second generation had not grown up in North Carolina before the Society began to consider the proposition of removing. In many instances the sons of the men who had come from Pennsylvania were among those who were now leaving North Carolina. Even some born in Pennsylvania lived to come to Ohio and Indiana with their Carolina-born children.

Since slavery had been one of the chief causes for the Quaker movement to the Northwest, it was only to be expected that they would maintain their interest in the subject. There was not a year from the establishment of Friends in the Northwest until the slave was freed but what their attention was called officially to the subject in an annual query asking whether Friends bore a testimony against slavery. Committees were likewise appointed on "Concerns of the People of Colour". The legislatures of the States formed from the Northwest Territory were frequently petitioned on the subject of the so-called "Black Laws". The Friends officially memorialized Congress frequently on the subject of slavery, and they were especially emphatic in their opposition to the admission of Texas. Their most immediate labors in behalf of the slaves were, however, exerted in the activities of the Underground Railroad, one Friend having assisted three thousand negroes northward and another expressing regret that he had only had the opportunity of assisting two thousand seven hundred when the Emancipation Proclamation was issued.

While Friends in the Northwest were a unit in their

opposition to slavery, they could not agree as to the best method of accomplishing the desired end and in 1843 we meet the peculiar situation of a separation in the church, the conservative element standing for gradual emancipation and the development of a healthful public sentiment against the system, and the radical element demanding the immediate abolition of the system.

One can not leave this phase of the subject without mentioning Charles Osborn, who in 1814 organized the first manumission society in the South and in 1817 at Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, established the first anti-slavery paper, which was followed in 1821 by the *Genius of Universal Emancipation* edited by Benjamin Lundy, another Friend, who had been interested in publication by Charles Osborn. Three anti-slavery papers were issued by Friends at Fountain City, Indiana, during the forties and these no doubt exerted considerable influence at that time.

While as a rule Friends preferred to exert themselves as a religious body rather than through immediate political channels, their influence was felt directly. The final status of slavery in Indiana was determined after a long and vigorous contest, in every stage of which the Friends were a factor after they had entered the Territory. They were a determining factor in the campaign of 1810 when the anti-slavery forces triumphed in the election of a representative to the United States Congress and expressed themselves by petitions and through one of their members who was a delegate in the first Constitutional Convention. It is worthy of note that Edwin M. Stanton of Ohio came of a long line of Quaker ancestry as did George W. Julian of Indiana.

The Quakers being opposed to slavery supported the Whig or Free Soil parties until the formation of the Republican Party when they joined it. Theodore Clark Smith says, in his *Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the North West*, concerning the election of 1844: "In In-

diana the anti-slavery counties are those in which the Quakers lived. . . . There were New Englanders in the state but they were as yet not waked up." A study of the election returns of the State shows that as a rule those counties which contain a large number of Quakers are Republican, and there is no doubt but that the question of slavery was the principal force in causing the Quakers to become Republicans. The same reforming characteristics have caused many of the Quakers to ally themselves with the Prohibition Party since its organization.

In the early history of the State of Indiana, illiteracy was alarming but the Friends had schools organized while Indiana was still a Territory and they later developed a system of schools which set a standard for the system of public education established later. As a result of close supervision and the home training of Friends' children, the moral standard of these schools was very high and they were largely freed from the roughness and rowdiness which brought many a school-master in the early half of the nineteenth century to grief and failure. By 1850 the Friends had worked out a regular system of education for their children. Practically every community had its subscription school which was under the supervision of the local meeting. The same plan was pursued in Ohio, Illinois, and even in Michigan and Wisconsin.

Owing to local conditions, it was not advisable for each school to offer advanced work, but there were in each community a few pupils who wished to take more advanced work. As a result, certain schools were established which offered both elementary and more advanced courses. These schools corresponded to and later became modern high schools.

As shown by the yearly meeting reports on the subject of education there were in 1840, in the limits of the yearly meeting seven thousand six hundred and fifty-one

children of school age and of this number only three hundred and nineteen, or about one in twenty-four, were not in school. In the same year, according to Boone's *History of Education*, one-seventh of the population was illiterate. The school legislation in Indiana for thirty years had accomplished very little, and the condition of education was arousing much public sentiment. As a result a system of free schools was adopted after a hard fight by the State in 1848, but difficulties were encountered and very little was accomplished, especially along the lines of advanced education. The first attempt to establish a public high school in Indiana was in Evansville in 1850, while the Friends, by 1850, had twelve well organized schools doing advanced work which would compare favorably with our modern high schools. By 1867, eighteen high schools had been opened but some of these had been discontinued because of lack of funds, while by the same year the Friends had established twenty schools with advanced courses.

A Boarding School was established at Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, in 1837, and in 1845 a Manual Labor Institute was opened at Bloomingdale in western Indiana. By 1832 the Friends were considering definite plans for a denominational college which resulted in Earlham College which was opened in 1847. These facts are significant when the relatively small number of members is taken into consideration.

One of the leading characteristics of the Friends as a society has been their deep interest and activity in philanthropic and charitable work. This has been directed toward the Indians, negroes, and the pauper and criminal classes. The Friends of Philadelphia began an active campaign in behalf of the Indians in the Northwest Territory in 1791. Schools were established among them in Ohio and Indiana and from that time forward a direct and permanent interest in the affairs of the In-

dians in the Northwest was maintained. Elizabeth Comstock of Michigan, a Friends minister, visited more jails, reformatories, and penitentiaries in various parts of the Union than any other person in her time and has since been called the "Elizabeth Fry of America".

While Friends have been very active in prison reform since the days of George Fox, who had occasion to recognize the need of prison reform, no organization of Friends has officially undertaken the work except in Indiana. The first committee was appointed in 1867, and it is no exaggeration to affirm that their action was largely responsible for the establishment of the Boys' Reform School in 1869, of the Woman's Prison in 1873 (three of whose four superintendents have been Friends), and of the Indiana Board of State Charities.

In conclusion I can not refrain from alluding to one other line of Quaker activity. In 1819 when Jonathan Jennings was Governor of the State, when James Monroe was President of the United States, and Abraham Lincoln was a ten year old boy in Spencer County, Indiana, fifty-seven men, of whom thirty-nine were Quakers, met at Salem, Indiana, and organized the Salem Peace Society. A descendant of one of these Quakers has since 1892 been General Secretary of the American Peace Society and has made many trips abroad in the interests of peace and international arbitration; and the son of another in 1878 made a visit to St. Petersburg to lay before the Czar a memorial praying for exemption from military duty of all Russian subjects who had conscientious scruples against war, and urging upon the Czar the adoption of arbitration as a substitute for war. So it is not unreasonable to conclude that the Quakers of Indiana may have had some part in the influences which finally resulted in the establishment of the Hague Court.

To the Quaker holiness was his daily walk. It was his daily speech, his dress and address, his worship, his

every mien and performance. The impulses of his soul were the dynamics of his deeds and it seems that in their quiet way, the Quakers have exerted an influence in the Old Northwest quite beyond what might have been expected of them as far as numbers are concerned.

THE WESTERN RESERVE IN THE ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT

1840-1860

BY KARL F. GEISER

The period from 1840 to 1860 marks an epoch in American History; it begins with the crystallization of the nominating convention into a regular system, and ends with the breaking up of the Whig Party and a new alignment of political forces; it begins when the democracy of Jefferson and Jackson is finally established and ends when a new idea — humanity — is firmly fixed in American thought and is about to be carried, at immense cost, to a successful issue. It is a period in which a set of principles, a set of ideas, and a group of men are brought into national prominence, and when another set of ideas, principles, and group of men, recede into the background of history. Slavery is the key-note of this period, the first year of which marks a change in the anti-slavery movement from a moral to a political force, and the last year of which marks the beginning of a crisis. A study therefore of the causes of the forces which were arrayed against a system which threatened the government established by the fathers of the Constitution is as important as it is interesting; and a study of the geographic sources from whence these forces issued, the area, that is, in which they operated, is necessary to an understanding of the motives of the history of the anti-slavery movement. And since national movements in popular governments spring from men whose minds and actions are fashioned by local environment, in a proper study of the anti-slavery question, we should turn from the main stream of the move-

ment and examine the tributary causes which produced the general current of history.

That one of these areas tributary to the general anti-slavery movement in America was that district in northern Ohio known as the Western Reserve, is generally admitted by the historian, and I can not hope to do more than to add some local color to the narrative drawn by the general writers of the period.

It will be necessary first to call brief attention to this district in its historical relation to the State of Ohio, but before doing so a word should be said in regard to another district in southern Ohio. On March 1, 1784, Congress granted to Colonel George Rogers Clark and his officers and soldiers, as a reimbursement to Virginia for the expense incurred in defending that State against the British on the west, a tract of land on the Ohio River to provide for the bounties due the Virginia troops. A part of this tract lay between the Scioto and Little Miami rivers. This district, conceded by the United States to the Virginia soldiers, fell within the bounds of the present State of Ohio and was known as the Virginia Military District, and was subsequently settled by people from Virginia, Kentucky, and other Southern States. Western Reserve, on the other hand, lay in the northern part of Ohio and was a reservation by Connecticut as a foundation for its school fund, when in 1781 she ceded to the Union all the charter rights claimed by her in the Northwest Territory. It comprised about a dozen counties, bounded on the north by Lake Erie, and on the south by the forty-first parallel of north latitude, and extended from the State of Pennsylvania one hundred and twenty miles westward. This tract was settled by immigrants from New York and especially Connecticut and other New England States. Many of the settlers were attracted not merely by the rich lands and the love of adventure, but also because of the prestige which the free State, built upon the

Ordinance of 1787, had at once acquired. Companies were formed in New England which rivalled each other in the sale of land, and soon a stream of people holding Puritan views fringed the southern shore of Lake Erie, and formed the nucleus of a colony more intense in the Puritan spirit than New England itself. Hardened and intensified in their ideas of liberty and religious faith by the stubborn resistance which nature affords to the pioneer, these people in the forests of northern Ohio knew no earthly fear. With the great Ordinance as their fundamental charter of liberty, and with a creed commissioned out of the unseen, they built up a community which developed a character quick and strong to resist the evils of a later day. Thus two streams poured into the first State carved out of the Northwest Territory, the one carrying with it Southern customs, manners, institutions, and influences, and this stream centered about Cincinnati; the other, as already stated, going to Western Reserve and centering about Cleveland, Sandusky, Ashtabula Harbor, and later to Oberlin.

The Ordinance of 1787 provided that "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said territory, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted," but this clause did not apply to slaves already in the Territory. There were, however, at the time of the Ordinance very few, and these gradually died off, so that in 1840 the census for Ohio shows but three.¹ The first Ohio Constitution limited suffrage to whites but such restrictions did not operate against the migration of free negroes from Kentucky and the other neighboring States, while the free soil of Ohio naturally attracted fugitives from service. It had been

¹ The same census gives but three for Indiana, eleven for Wisconsin, sixteen for Iowa, and three hundred and thirty-one for Illinois, while Massachusetts, Maine, Vermont, and Michigan were entirely without slaves. — Goodell's *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, p. 115.

the policy of the States on both sides of the River to prevent such people from changing their domicile.

In 1804 and 1807 Ohio passed the famous "Black Laws", which provided "that no black or mulatto person shall be permitted to settle or reside in the state unless he shall first secure a certificate of his freedom under the seal of a court of record;" it provided furthermore, that no such person should migrate or settle within the State without giving bonds in the sum of five hundred dollars as a condition for his good behavior. It forbade a black or mulatto to give evidence or be sworn in a court where a white person was a party; it denied him the right to participate in the use of the school funds arising from Congressional grants; and it denied him the right to a trial by jury, even in cases involving his personal liberty.

These laws were passed by the legislature in spite of the Ordinance of 1787, which secured the right of the writ of *habeas corpus* and trial by jury, and in spite of the Constitution of Ohio which reaffirmed these liberties and added still others.² This law, however, remained a dead letter, partly because of the difficulty of enforcing it, but chiefly because of the demand for manual laborers.³ In 1810, when an attempt was made to enforce the registration laws in Cincinnati, the colored people sent a delegation to Canada to consider locating there; and when migration was proposed a riot ensued which eventually resulted in driving eleven hundred of the twenty-two hundred negroes out of the city, many of whom went to Canada.⁴

Yet it was in the southern part of Ohio that the anti-slavery sentiment of the State which later involved Western Reserve was first kindled, as we shall presently learn. Those people of the State who lived along the Ohio River and saw the operation of the "Black Laws", of the Fugi-

² Smith's *Political History of Slavery*, p. 14.

³ Hart's *Salmon P. Chase*, p. 30.

⁴ Hart's *Salmon P. Chase*, p. 31.

tive Slave Law, and the institution of slavery itself in a neighboring State, were particularly fitted to contrast freedom and slavery in their moral and economic aspects, and it is therefore not strange to find here an early development of anti-slavery sentiment. Professor Hart says, "An anti-slavery society, founded at Ripley, Ohio, probably before 1810, continued to exist for more than twenty years; and so late as 1820 national anti-slavery conventions were held, usually in the southern states, and sent out appeals against the system, and memorials to Congress. The feeling on this subject was not very different in Ohio and Kentucky and freedom of speech in criticism of slavery was about as great in one community as in another."⁵

The Missouri Compromise debate did much to change sentiment and force new alignments for and against slavery, but public opinion throughout the country did not seem to lend its moral support to the anti-slavery cause prior to 1840. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which met in Cincinnati in 1836, disclaimed "any right, wish or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relations between master and slave, as it exists in the slave-holding states of the Union."⁶ This same Conference deprecated "the great excitement on the subject of modern Abolitionism," and resolved "that they disapprove in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of the two members of the General Conference who are reported to have lectured in this city (Cincinnati) in favor of modern Abolitionism."⁷ This resolution was adopted by a vote of 122 to 11. The Conference also adopted a pastoral address to the communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in which they state that "from every view of the subject which we have been able to take, and from the most calm and dispassion-

⁵ Hart's *Salmon P. Chase*, p. 15.

⁶ Goodell's *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, p. 426.

⁷ Goodell's *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, p. 426.

ate survey of the whole ground, we have come to the conclusion that the only safe, scriptural, and prudent way for us, both as ministers and people, to take, is wholly to refrain from this agitating subject."⁸ This was signed by order and in behalf of the General Conference by the bishops.

Nor is it to be assumed that these sentiments were formed by Southern influence alone. The Conference represented the Northern and Southern portions of the Church, and the Ohio Annual Conference had, a short time before, "Resolved, That we deeply regret the proceedings of the Abolitionists, and anti-slavery societies, in the free states, and the consequent excitement produced thereby in the slave states, that we, as a Conference, disclaim all connection and cooperation with, or belief in the same, and that we hereby recommend to our junior preachers, local brethren, and private members within our bounds, to abstain from any connection with them or participation of their acts, in the premises, whatever. That those brethren and citizens of the north who resist the Abolition movements with firmness and moderation, are the true friends to the church, to the slaves of the south, and to the Constitution of our common country."⁹ It should be said in this connection, however, that neither the Scotch Covenanters nor the Wesleyan Methodists, excluded the negro from communion with the church, and where either of these two sects had churches, there was likely to be found an underground railroad in active operation.¹⁰

But the general sentiment of the country as late as 1837 was against every movement looking toward the abolition of slavery. When the financial crisis of that year left Oberlin College with a deficit of \$30,000 there was no prospect of obtaining funds in this country because there was no general sympathy with the anti-slavery sentiments

⁸ Goodell's *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, p. 426.

⁹ Goodell's *Slavery and Anti-Slavery*, p. 428.

¹⁰ Siebert's *Underground Railroad*, p. 32.

expressed by the representatives of that institution. "The great mass of the people of Ohio were utterly opposed to our enterprise", writes Charles G. Finney,¹¹ "because of its abolition character. The towns around us were hostile to our movement, and in some places threats were made to come and tear down our buildings. A Democratic legislature was, in the meantime, endeavoring to get some hold of us, that would enable them to abrogate our charter." Against this general sentiment of the country there were local forces at work in western Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio — especially in Western Reserve — which were soon to more than counteract those making for slavery. Among the most potent forces thus at work was that of Congregationalism. In fact it was the only sect in Western Reserve which took a decided stand against slavery. The attitude of the Methodist Church was practically that of all other churches. They were conservative and believed that religion was a thing apart from politics, a thing from which they should hold aloof. Congregationalism was hindered, however, by its union in Western Reserve with Presbyterianism. A word of explanation is necessary to make this clear.

When the early missionaries and settlers came into northern Ohio the leading sects were of these two denominations. To strengthen the work in a common cause, the Congregationalists in Western Reserve united in 1801 with the Presbyterians. This union continued without serious friction until about 1830 when the slavery question became an issue, and this issue proved to be the rock which was to shatter the union and which finally led to a separation of the two churches in 1852.¹² Congregational ministers and individual churches had frequently been disciplined because of their anti-slavery sentiments. For example in 1840 the Huron Presbytery refused to license

¹¹ Finney's *Memoirs*, p. 337.

¹² Leonard's *A Century of Congregationalism in Ohio*, pp. 35 et seq.

James H. and F. H. Fairchild because they declined to declare that they did not believe "in the doctrines taught at Oberlin and in their way of doing things".¹³ As the slavery question became more keen, the Congregationalists became more aggressive in their anti-slavery attitude, and this position they maintained throughout the period of agitation; and when it became evident that their principles were hampered by reactionary forces, too strong to overcome in the Presbytery, they chose separation and independence.¹⁴

Thus the Congregational Church was instrumental in creating an aggressive anti-slavery leadership — religious, journalistic and political — which, with the leavening influence of Oberlin College, contributed to propagate a sentiment that was ready to support the fleeing slave, and which laid the foundation of the numerous interlacing lines of the underground railroads which traversed northern Ohio and brought into the court and the legislature the question of the Fugitive Slave Law and other issues connected with slavery.¹⁵ These forces set in motion were destined soon to revolutionize the political thought of the time. The rapid growth of the anti-slavery sentiment as a political factor may be partly judged by the growth of the Liberty Party, which first met in national convention at Albany in 1840. The entire vote cast in the fall of that year was less than 7,000. In 1844 the Liberty candidates received upwards of 60,000 votes.

With this general though imperfect background of slavery sentiment, what specific contributions, it may be asked, did Western Reserve make to the anti-slavery

¹³ Leonard's *A Century of Congregationalism in Ohio*, p. 51.

¹⁴ In some parts of southern Ohio there were in the Presbyterian Church many anti-slavery members. We read of a "call" for an anti-slavery convention in Hamilton, Butler County, on August 16, 1844, by the "Anti-Slavery Presbyterians". See "Correspondence of Ebenezer Thomas, Mainly Relating to the Anti-Slavery Conflict in Ohio especially in the Presbyterian Church", published by his son, 1909, Dayton, Ohio.

¹⁵ Siebert's *Underground Railroad*, p. 115.

movement? Her contributions may be considered along two lines: moral and political; and these in turn affected the political history of the State and the nation. In the State the repeal of the "Black Laws" was an objective point for the Abolitionists and this repeal had to be obtained by action of the State legislature. But in 1840 the State legislature was still disinclined to take active measures in behalf of the negroes. Public sentiment had to be educated and it took eight more years to accomplish this, although repeated attempts had been made since 1830 to repeal the legal discriminations against color.

Two centers of influence were largely responsible for the change of sentiment; one of these centers was in and about Cincinnati, and the other, by far the more important, was Western Reserve. In the former there was a group of powerful enemies of slavery — sons of former slave-owners or former slave-owners themselves — men who out of their own experience had come to hate slavery and to fight it, but they constituted a small minority and were not generally upheld in their views by the community. Many of the business men of Cincinnati drew a large part of their trade from Covington, across the river, and then, as always, business was conservative and disinclined to look with favor upon change and reform. In Western Reserve, on the other hand, slavery was viewed more in the abstract, as something extraneous to the community. Here they were Abolitionists from principle, and in this principle the entire community — with very few individual exceptions — concurred. Any anti-slavery institution or movement therefore which found lodgment in Western Reserve was carried to a successful issue because the majority in the community gave it moral sanction.

This difference in sentiment between southern and northern Ohio is illustrated in the origin and history of two educational institutions — Lane Seminary in the

south and Oberlin College in the north. Lane Seminary had been founded in 1829 at Walnut Hills, a suburb of Cincinnati, for the purpose of training men for the Presbyterian ministry. Lyman Beecher of Connecticut was President and Professor of Theology, and associated with him was his son-in-law, Professor Stowe. Lane Seminary had collected a vigorous body of students, many of them from Oneida Institute, a school in central New York. Among them was Theodore D. Weld, a young man of great personal influence, eloquence and power, who later became prominent in the anti-slavery movement. He had while in New York come under the influence of Garrison, was seized by his spirit, and was therefore fitted to proclaim with fervid eloquence in the wilderness of the new and rugged West the sentiments expressed in the *Liberator* in the quiet East. More than half of the students at Lane, however, were Southerners, and with this dual sentiment, it is not strange that among the one hundred or more students in the institution the question of slavery should have been discussed; one debate which was held in chapel lasted eighteen consecutive nights. A former slave was allowed to give his testimony and, when the heated discussion closed, a number of Southern students were converted to the anti-slavery cause. The debate attracted considerable attention in the community and the trustees became alarmed. In the vacation which followed, the trustees, therefore, taking advantage of the absence in the East of Professors Beecher, Stowe, and Morgan, met, in August, 1834, and forbade the discussion of slavery in the institution. At the same time they sent word to Professor Morgan that his services were no longer needed. As a result of this action the president of the board of trustees, Rev. Asa Mahan, who vigorously opposed it, resigned. The students, upon returning to their work in the fall, protested without avail, and fifty-one of their number, four-fifths of the entire body, left the institution and took

possession of a building tendered them by James Ludlow, who resided a few miles from the city. Here they continued their studies with such instruction as they could afford each other.¹⁶ In the meantime the "Oberlin Colony", a Christian commonwealth, was being founded in the northern part of the State.

The plan of this community originated with Rev. John J. Shipherd in 1832, while he was pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Elyria. Associated with him in the enterprise was P. P. Stewart, formerly a missionary among the Indians, and at the time residing in Mr. Shipherd's family.¹⁷ A spot was chosen thirty-four miles west of Cleveland, in Lorain County, and here a school was to be established with various departments — preparatory, teachers, collegiate, and theological. The school was to be surrounded by a Christian community made up of families who could unite "in the faith of the Gospel and in self-denying efforts to establish and build up and sustain the school".¹⁸ Those who joined the community were asked to subscribe to articles of agreement called the "Oberlin Covenant" in which they agreed to fix their residence here "for the express purpose of glorifying God in doing good to men" to the extent of their ability.

It was on April 19, 1833, that the first "colonist", Peter P. Pease, pitched his tent on what is now the southeast corner of the College Square. The rigors of winter were not yet passed when this hardy pioneer arrived. Nature still stinted her joys; the song birds had not yet arrived to break the monotony of the forest which surrounded his solitary home; the Indians' hunting path was the only evidence that human life had ever pulsed here, while the hunting song of the gray wolf at night reminded him that in the trackless forest, yet to be subdued, wild life was still in the ascendant. But the first settlers soon

¹⁶ Fairchild's *Oberlin: The Colony and the College*, Ch. III.

¹⁷ Fairchild's *Oberlin: The Colony and the College*, pp. 3 et seq.

¹⁸ Fairchild's *Oberlin: The Colony and the College*, p. 4.

gathered; families came from several of the New England States, from New York, and other parts of Ohio — all of New England origin. In the same year the first college building was erected and in December the "Oberlin Collegiate Institute" was opened with an enrollment of forty-four students which in the summer session of the following year (1834) had mounted to one hundred and one. Then came a critical period in the history of Oberlin. The authorities of the institution were confronted by a question upon the decision of which the future of the College depended; and the importance of the question warrants a brief narrative of the events which led to the decision at which the trustees finally arrived.

When the seceding students left Lane Seminary, Arthur Tappan of New York, a prominent member of the American Anti-slavery Society, and a friend of Whittier, offered the seceders \$5000 and the promise of a professorship if they would establish a school under anti-slavery principles and influences. Between him and Mr. Shepherd a plan was devised for adding at once a theological department to Oberlin College and bringing the seceding students from Lane Seminary to constitute the first theological class. Under date of December 15, 1834, Mr. Shepherd wrote to the trustees of Oberlin and urged the appointment of Rev. Asa Mahan as President and Rev. John Morgan as Professor of Mathematics. "I desire", he said, "at the first meeting of the trustees, the passage of the following resolution, to wit: Resolved, That students shall be received *irrespective of color*." Now the original plan of Oberlin had not contemplated such an innovation. No such conditions as here proposed had ever been heard of. There was no school in the world admitting students unconditionally "*irrespective of color*", and the excitement in Oberlin was intense. Nor was the excitement lessened when it was learned that the trustees had made arrangements to hold their session for consider-

ing the proposal in the calmer atmosphere of Elyria. A petition was presented to the board that the "honorable body will meet at Oberlin." The petitioners conclude: "We feel for our black brethren — we feel to want your counsels and instructions; we want to know what is duty, and, God assisting us, we will lay aside every prejudice, and do as we shall be led to believe that God would have us to do."¹⁹ The trustees were in doubt: their action was non-committal. Nor was it strange that they wished the institution "to be on the same ground, in respect to the admission of students, with other similar institutions of the land." At this session of the board, however, Mr. Mahan and Professor Morgan were appointed, according to the request of Mr. Shipherd. But the latter was disappointed, though not discouraged. He had gone to New York in company with Mahan to confer with Arthur and Lewis Tappan and other anti-slavery men with reference to bringing to Oberlin the Lane seceders, establishing a theological department, and placing the institution upon a distinctly anti-slavery basis. When the report of the action of the trustees reached Mr. Shipherd he wrote them again a long appeal "warning them against yielding to a worldly spirit and worldly principles." Another meeting was held, this time in Oberlin on February 9, 1835. Mr. Shipherd's proposal carried and this meeting determined the policy of the institution on the slavery question and no other action has been taken since.

While the decision was an "invitation and welcome to the colored man as opposed to the exclusion then dominant in the land,"²⁰ there were no colored students who immediately applied for admission; in fact at that time but one person of color resided in the county, but it was generally expected that large numbers would come, and those who opposed the resolution admitting them were

¹⁹ Quoted in Fairchild's *Oberlin: The Colony and the College*, p. 57.

²⁰ Fairchild's *Oberlin: The Colony and the College*, p. 64.

quite disappointed when their apprehensions proved groundless. The story is told that when at length a solitary colored man was seen entering the settlement, a little boy, the son of one of the trustees who had prophesied evil consequences as a result of the decision, ran hopefully to the house, calling out, "They're coming, father — they're coming."²¹ But while very few colored students ever availed themselves of the opportunities offered, the principle involved in the decision was momentous; on that principle Oberlin took a decided stand; it was the first of its kind since man has kept a record of events. The College was placed in the midst of a current of opinions and that current identified it with the history of the nation for the next quarter of a century.

At the same meeting of the trustees, Rev. Charles G. Finney was appointed Professor of Theology. He was then pastor of a Congregational Church in New York, and the Tappans and other prominent anti-slavery men were members of his church. Thus was established a connection between prominent and influential men of the East and this new anti-slavery center of the West. Arthur Tappan himself pledged \$10,000 to erect the building intended primarily for the theological department and secured a loan of \$10,000 more for other necessary buildings and improvements. Others united with the Tappans in what was called "The Oberlin Professorship Association", agreeing to pay the interest on \$80,000 to be devoted to the salaries of eight professors at \$600 each. The institution was thus placed on a financial footing which, in spite of reverses occasioned by the panic of 1837, enabled it to become the leading anti-slavery center west of the Alleghenies.

In 1835 the various departments were fully organized; the attendance increased rapidly, numbering 276 at the end of that year. Five years later it had nearly

²¹ Fairchild's *Oberlin: The Colony and the College*, pp. 64, 65.

doubled its enrollment, and in 1860 the total attendance was 1311, of which number 803 were men.²² Nor should it be assumed that the young women in attendance were a negative factor in propagating anti-slavery sentiment. When the question of admitting colored students was first proposed many who had come from New England families of culture and refinement declared that, if colored students were admitted, they would return to their homes, if they had to "wade Lake Erie" to accomplish it. But the sentiment soon changed and they showed their New England spirit, not by wading Lake Erie, but by fearlessly stemming abuse and advocating the cause of the oppressed race.²³

Thus from 1835 till the close of the Civil War Oberlin was a potent factor in molding the thought and shaping the actions upon all questions that arose out of slavery, migration, and westward expansion. The pronounced anti-slavery position frequently brought to Oberlin the prominent apostles of Abolitionism. William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglas came and tried to convince the College authorities that the proper anti-slavery position was to withdraw from all political action; that the Constitution of the United States was pro-slavery and corrupt and that all who voted shared in its wickedness; that the strongest testimony against slavery was to refuse to take part in the affairs of government. But Oberlin soon after its foundation joined and continued with the voting Abolitionists.

Being the only college in America which admitted students without distinction of color or sex, Oberlin soon attracted universal attention; it became a station on the Underground Railroad; hated in the South and advertised in the North, supported by Abolitionists at home and abroad, it became a hive from which swarmed forth lec-

²² In 1860 Harvard had 848 students and Yale, 642.

²³ Fairchild's *Oberlin: The Colony and the College*, p. 56.

turers under the auspices of the American Anti-Slavery Society. "Through the influence largely of Oberlin, western Ohio became strongly leavened with anti-Slavery sentiment, finding friends, bitter enemies and encountering ferocious mobs."²⁴ At an anti-slavery convention in London in 1840 it was spoken of as the one college in America which "furnishes a home for the black man".²⁵ When in that year it had a financial deficit of \$30,000, this amount was contributed by the Friends or Quakers in England, parents of Florence Nightingale being among the contributors, while Henry M. Stanley paid it the compliment of advising his brother to go to Oberlin to get an education.

In speaking of the influence of Oberlin College on public affairs with special reference to slavery, General J. D. Cox says: "It would be rash to assign to any one influence a decisive and preeminent power, for all the circumstances of the time and the march of intellect and progress in the whole race, combined to remove from the earth an institution that belonged to the dark ages; but I unhesitatingly assert that there is hardly a township west of the Alleghenies and north of the central line of Ohio, in which the influence of Oberlin men and Oberlin opinions cannot be specifically identified and traced. It was a propaganda of a school of thought and action having distinct characteristics and as easily recognizable in its work as was that of Garrison and the American Anti-Slavery Society in their methods and work."²⁶ When we consider the purpose and spirit that dominated the institution, and the number of students during the period from 1840 to 1860, it must be admitted that the statement is not greatly overdrawn.

²⁴ Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. II, p. 126.

²⁵ Oberlin never had a large number of colored students. Of the twenty thousand students from the beginning of the College to 1883, only one thousand were blacks.

²⁶ *The Oberlin Jubilee, 1833-1883* (edited by W. G. Ballantine), p. 292.

Editor J. A. Harris of the *Cleveland Leader*, in an issue of 1845, writes, after a visit to Oberlin: "The College exerts a wide and healthy influence. The average number of students for the last five years is five hundred and twenty-eight." And in the same article he says its purpose is "to establish universal liberty by the abolition of every form of sin"; and also "to avoid the debasing association of the heathen classics, and make the Bible a text-book in all the departments of education." He reluctantly adds: "we confess that much of our prejudice against the Oberlin College has been removed by a visit to the institution."²⁷ Says Rhodes²⁸: "Oberlin College had fame abroad, not for deep learning and wide culture, but for its radical methods. . . . In 1859 it was especially known as a center of strong anti-slavery opinions and deep religious convictions. Actuated by those sentiments, the reception given to the higher-law doctrine as a rule of action towards the Fugitive Slave act was zealous and complete. By its friends it was called a highly moral and severely religious town, 'an asylum for the oppressed of all God's creation, without distinction of color.' By its enemies it was stigmatized as a hot-bed of abolitionism, and as 'that old buzzard's nest where the negroes who arrive over the Underground Railroad are regarded as dear children.' "

The newspapers of the time are full of praise and condemnation of Oberlin College, and the condemnation is by no means least important in forming our estimate of its influence in the anti-slavery movement. The newspaper files, pamphlets, local histories, and the opinions of men still living, whose memory goes back to this period — all attest the fact that Oberlin was thoroughly despised by the pro-slavery men of the time and praised and supported by the anti-slavery men. With these facts before us

²⁷ Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. II, p. 125.

²⁸ Rhodes's *History of the United States*, Vol. II, pp. 361, 362.

we may safely conclude that its student body — both men and women — were without exception, positive factors in disseminating the principles for which the College stood; and Professor G. F. Wright, who was among the number, tells me that "Before the Civil War five hundred men left the institution every winter to teach school throughout Western Reserve and throughout the State and even throughout the South."²⁹ And they were men whose works went hand in hand with their faith. When Lincoln's call for troops came, Oberlin responded with two companies of volunteers, but only one company was accepted.

I have dwelt at length upon Oberlin College because it was the only educational institution in Western Reserve which stood as the champion of the anti-slavery cause. It was not, however, the only anti-slavery center in Western Reserve. Elishur Wright and Beriah Green, professors in Western Reserve College at Hudson, were strong anti-slavery advocates who were compelled to resign on account of their utterances upon the subject. But the seeds sown in various centers throughout the district fell upon fertile soil and soon there grew up a constituency, massed in one Congressional district, in which the anti-slavery men were predominant. From this district of the Western Reserve Joshua R. Giddings was sent to the national House of Representatives in 1838 as the first Western anti-slavery member.

An incident may serve to illustrate how strong and united the anti-slavery sentiment was in the northeastern part of Ohio. When in 1841 the *Creole*, an American vessel, sailed from Virginia to Louisiana with a cargo of slaves who got possession of the vessel and ran it into a British port and in accordance with British law were set free, and when Webster, then Secretary of State, informed the British government that America would de-

²⁹ Conversation.

mand indemnification for the slaves, Giddings offered a series of resolutions in which it was declared that as slavery was an abridgment of a natural right, it had no force beyond the territorial jurisdiction that created it; that when an American vessel was on the high seas, it was under the jurisdiction of the general government which did not sanction slavery and therefore the mutineers of the Creole had only assumed their natural right to liberty and the attempt to enslave them would be dishonorable. Though he temporarily withdrew the resolutions, the House passed a vote of censure, one hundred and twenty-five to sixty-nine. He immediately resigned and appealing to his constituents was reëlected by an almost unanimous majority. For twenty years this Representative of Western Reserve held his seat in Congress, opposing every encroachment of the slave power with a boldness and strength that commanded the respect and fear of its advocates.

Among the ordinary citizens throughout the Reserve district the anti-slavery sentiment was also strong but certain sections, because of distinguished leaders or because they were traversed by the Underground Railroad or contained stations on the line, became conspicuous as molders of public sentiment. Such was Ashtabula County in the extreme northeast. A county anti-slavery society was here formed in June, 1832, and this was followed by local organizations in various parts of the County and these activities continued during the entire period of the anti-slavery contest. In 1837 the radical anti-slavery element of Ashtabula County had no great force as we learn from the proceedings in one of the local societies in which it was "resolved that the constitution was a covenant with death and a league with hell". The local chronicler writes that "all listened but few believed". The societies were at first organized on the principle of moral suasion, but in 1850 the militant spirit was mani-

fest: they denounced the Fugitive Slave Law and declared "that sooner than submit to such odious laws, we will see the Union dissolved; sooner than see slavery perpetuated, we would see war; and sooner than be slaves we will fight."³⁰

Ashtabula County was also noted for its prominent men who distinguished themselves in public. Jefferson, the county seat, was the home of Senator Benjamin F. Wade, Joshua R. Giddings, A. G. Riddle, W. C. Howells, father of W. D. Howells, Rufus P. Ranney, twice Judge of the Supreme Court of Ohio, member of the Constitutional Convention, United States District Attorney for the northern district of Ohio in 1857, and, in the same year, a Democratic candidate for Governor against William Dennison. These names suggest the direct influence exercised by Western Reserve in the political life of the State and nation. Indeed the investigator of its local history is struck by the long list of men, prominent in various activities of life, who exerted a strong indirect influence then and upon a later generation — men who, unappreciated by their own community, yet possessed qualities of leadership, but fell a little below the range of the chronicler of national events. Then there were the local leaders that must not be left out of account; earnest souls doing the humble work of organizing local societies, addressing churches, schools, and town meetings; men and women known only within a narrow circle and remembered only by the generation in which they lived. A few of their names, thanks to the local historian, have been preserved, and I shall contribute a brief record of one of them to the annals of this Association.

While Wade and Giddings represented Ashtabula in Congress, a woman, Betsey Cowles, a teacher by profession, more than any other person created in Ashtabula the

³⁰ Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. I, p. 280. There was at this time an Underground Railroad from Wheeling to the Harbor at Ashtabula.

sentiments which upheld them. Born in 1810 in Bristol, Connecticut, her father, Rev. Dr. Giles Hooker Cowles, during her infancy came to Austinburg with his family. During the entire anti-slavery agitation period, Miss Cowles, with her sister, was an active worker in the county and local community, organizing, addressing, and singing in improvised quartettes, the effect of which is expressed by the local chronicler in these words: "Bosoms hardened before, thrilled in sympathy with an influence they could not but feel, and melted before a power they could not withstand."³¹

The sentiment thus cultivated in the local communities found its way to the representatives in Congress and the State legislature, and when in 1854 the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was introduced into Congress petitions and letters without number were sent to the members who represented Western Reserve. That anti-slavery sentiment in northern Ohio was moreover expressed by all political parties is shown from an account of a mass meeting given us by General Roeliff Brinkerhoff in his *Recollections of a Lifetime*.³² Brinkerhoff was a prominent Democrat, an intimate friend of Salmon P. Chase, and for many years a resident of Mansfield, Ashland County, bordering on the Western Reserve on the south. Since this is typical of the sentiment and procedure throughout the Western Reserve, I quote his own words: "As I look over the call of the meeting which I have kept in a scrap book I find that it was signed by one hundred and thirty-four citizens of Mansfield and Richland county of whom about twenty are now (1899) living and of the entire list I was the youngest. The call was as follows: 'The undersigned, without distinction of party, invite a meeting of the citizens of Mansfield and vicinity, Friday, Feb. 17, 1854, to consider the Nebraska Bill, now

³¹ Howe's *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Vol. I, p. 281.

³² Brinkerhoff's *Recollections of a Lifetime*, pp. 89, 90.

pending in Congress.' The names appended were pretty equally divided between the old political parties, but when the meeting assembled and the country people came in, the Democrats were in the ascendant. At any rate those who came to the front were mainly Democrats. Levy Stevenson, an old Democrat wheel-horse, from Weller township was President and I was Secretary. Among the speakers, I remember, were Samuel J. Kirkwood, Jacob Brinkerhoff, and Barnabas Burns, all Democrats and all men of national reputation later on. The only record of the proceedings now in my possession seem to be the resolutions adopted unanimously by the meeting, and my recollection is that they were reported by Samuel J. Kirkwood, as chairman of the committee on resolutions." Continuing farther, he says: "The report of the committee on resolutions presented compactly and clearly the history of the Missouri Compromise, and closed with the following resolutions: 'Resolved, that in view of the foregoing considerations, we are opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, deliberately entered into for the settlement of an exciting and dangerous controversy, because such repeal would tend to destroy confidence in the other compromises touching the subject of slavery, and to produce uneasiness and distrust in the public mind; because we conceive it to be in violation of the wholesome and sound doctrine announced by the convention of 1852 on the agitation of the slavery question, and because we believe its effects would be to renew that agitation and again to produce between different sections of our country, strife, confusion, bitterness and discord. Resolved that the foregoing preamble and resolutions be published in our county papers, and that a copy thereof be forwarded to our senators and representatives in congress and to the Hon. Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, and to the President of the United States.' "

The strong anti-slavery sentiment in Western Re-

serve counted with telling effect upon the political fortunes of the State and nation in the important State election of 1848. The events of that year are so clearly set forth in Professor Hart's *Salmon P. Chase*³³ that I will merely summarize the results. In that year the State legislature was so equally divided between the Democrats and the Whigs that two members from Western Reserve, Dr. N. S. Townshend and J. F. Morse, Independent Free-Soilers, held the balance of power and by its skillful exercise forced the repeal of the obnoxious "Black Laws" and brought about the election of Chase to the United States Senate. Morse was a neighbor of Joshua R. Giddings and to Townshend, a life-long friend of Chase, must be given the credit of modifying or at least influencing the latter's views on the slavery question and inclining him more strongly to the anti-slavery cause.³⁴ Townshend, who was older than Chase, first met the latter at a trial in Cincinnati for the violation of the Fugitive Slave Law. During this trial a young man, known only to a few, volunteered his services and the speech he made was so remarkable for eloquence and force and so accorded with Townshend's own opinions and convictions that he sought a meeting with the young man and was introduced to Salmon P. Chase. This acquaintance lasted through the lives of both. In 1840 Townshend was elected as a delegate by the Anti-Slavery Society of America to the World's Anti-Slavery Society held in June of that year in London. He represented Western Reserve in the lower house of the Ohio State Legislature in 1848. In 1850 he was elected to the Thirty-second Congress and in 1853 he again served his State in the Senate of Ohio.

But perhaps the most conspicuous part played by Western Reserve in the anti-slavery movement was in 1859, a year memorable in the annals of Ohio on account

³³ Hart's *Salmon P. Chase*, p. 105.

³⁴ *Proceedings of the Columbus Horticultural Society*, Vol. X, pp. 90-94.

of the Oberlin-Wellington Rescue³⁵ case and the decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio sustaining the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law. The Oberlin-Wellington case briefly stated was this: "In September, 1858, a slave catcher, while at Oberlin seeking some of his own escaped slaves lighted upon a negro, John, who had more than two years previously fled from a Kentucky neighbor."³⁶ Fearing that if he made the arrest in Oberlin, there might be trouble, he had the negro decoyed to Wellington, a village nine miles south and a station on the Underground Railroad. Here he expected to have the fugitive examined before a United States Commissioner. When the people of Oberlin got news of the capture a large crowd of men from the College and town proceeded to Wellington, took the negro from his captors, and sent him on to Canada. Warrants were issued by the United States District Court in Cleveland and thirty-seven Oberlin people, including Professor Peck of the College, were arrested and indicted and taken to the Cleveland jail and held for trial. The court offered to liberate them on their own recognizance while awaiting trial but they preferred to remain in jail as martyrs to the cause of freedom. Later two of them were tried and convicted while the rest of the number waited their return in jail. Winter passed, mass meetings of sympathy were held all over Western Reserve, and on May 24th, an immense mass meeting was held in Cleveland which cheered the orators of the day who denounced the Fugitive Slave Law. Still the prisoners remained in jail. Meanwhile the grand jury of Lorain County in which Oberlin is situated, had indicted the men who captured the fugitive for kidnapping and attempting to carry out of the State in an unlawful manner the negro, John. After lengthy negotiations between the county authorities and those of the United States, a

³⁵ See Shipherd's *History of the Oberlin-Wellington Rescue* (1859).

³⁶ Rhodes's *History of the United States*, Vol. II, p. 362.

compromise was effected in which the remaining Oberlin prisoners were dismissed. A hundred guns were fired in Cleveland in honor of their liberation and Oberlin gave them an enthusiastic reception. The whole affair created a profound impression upon the people of Western Reserve and had an important influence upon the Republican Convention which met in June, 1859.

After the conviction of the two members, already referred to, the question of the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law was raised in the Ohio Supreme Court by a writ of *habeas corpus*, and the court, a short time prior to the Convention, had decided against the prisoners by a majority of three to two. Chief Justice Swan gave the majority opinion and Judge Brinkerhoff of Western Reserve the minority. Two days later the Convention met, and a crisis threatened the party. Judge Swan, who had given the majority opinion favoring the Fugitive Slave Law, was a candidate for reelection and was favored by the southern delegates but was strongly opposed by those from Western Reserve. The results of the Convention may be briefly summarized: General Brinkerhoff, a kinsman of Judge Brinkerhoff, was made a member of the Committee on Resolutions through the influence of Western Reserve, and it was he who drafted a resolution which united the two factions upon the Fugitive Slave Law, the storm center of the Convention. It was supported in committee and on the floor of the Convention by James Monroe, Professor of Political Science in Oberlin College, and by Henry D. Cook, editor of the *Sandusky Register*. Joshua R. Giddings was also prominent in the Convention and Benjamin F. Wade from Cleveland, United States Senator, was both temporary and permanent chairman of the Convention. All these men were from Western Reserve; they held the balance of power and controlled the Convention, the deliberations of which resulted in the nomination of William Den-

nison for Governor, and William Y. Gholson of Cincinnati to succeed Judge Swan. The entire Republican ticket was elected in October and the victory in Ohio in 1859 made possible a national victory in 1860 which resulted in the election of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY IN THE MOVEMENT FOR FIFTY-FOUR FORTY OR FIGHT

BY DANIEL WAIT HOWE

For a long period prior to 1843 there had been a controversy between Great Britain and the United States over the boundary line dividing the territory known as the Oregon Country, including the land now embraced in the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming. A treaty concluded between the two nations in 1818 provided for a joint occupation of the territory "that may be claimed by either party in the north-west coast of America, west of the Stony (Rocky) mountains", for a term of ten years. By a subsequent treaty, concluded on August 6, 1827, the provisions of the former treaty providing for a joint occupation were indefinitely extended and continued in force, with a further provision that either of the contracting parties should have the right to abrogate the treaty on giving the other twelve months' notice. Further negotiations followed, in the course of which Great Britain claimed as far south as the forty-second parallel of north latitude, while the United States claimed as far north as the line of $54^{\circ} 40'$.

Meanwhile both American and English immigrants, but mostly American, were moving into the territory and making settlements and there was constantly increasing danger of conflicts of jurisdiction inimical to peaceful relations between the two nations. The Americans already settled in the territory and those in other parts of the country, especially in the West and Northwest, who wanted to settle there, were clamoring for the government of the United States to extend the protection of its

laws over the territory. In the year 1843 many public meetings and conventions were held in the United States at which resolutions were adopted favoring prompt action by the national government in reference to Oregon. At all, or nearly all, of these meetings inflammatory resolutions were adopted, assuming the title of the United States to the whole of Oregon up to the line of $54^{\circ} 40'$ to be "unquestionable", denouncing the arrogance and insolence of Great Britain, and recommending the immediate occupation of the whole of the territory by the United States, the building of forts and stockades, and the maintenance of a fleet on the Pacific Coast.

In April, 1843, a call was issued for a convention of the Southern and Western States to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, in July following, the purpose of which was to induce governmental action in relation to Oregon. The convention was held on July 3, 4, and 5. Colonel Richard M. Johnson, ex-Vice President, presided. There were present some ninety or more delegates from six different States in the Mississippi Valley. Among other resolutions adopted were the following:

Resolved: That the right of the United States to the Oregon territory from 42° to $54^{\circ} 40'$ north latitude is unquestionable, and that it is the imperative duty of the general government forthwith to extend the laws of the United States over said territory.

Resolved: further, that to encourage migration to and secure the permanent settlement of said territory, the Congress of the United States ought to establish a line of forts from the Missouri river to the Pacific ocean, and provide also an efficient naval force for the protection of the territory and its citizens.

The convention also put forth "A Declaration of citizens of the Mississippi Valley", in which it was stated "that, however indignant at the avarice pride and ambition of Great Britain, so frequently, lawlessly, and so lately evinced, as we yet believe that it is for the benefit of all civilized nations that we should fulfill a legitimate destiny; but that she should be checked in her career of

M 7011

aggression with impunity and dominion without right.
 . . . That so far as regards our rights to the territory in question, we are assured of their perfect integrity, based, as they are, on the discovery and exploration by our own citizens and government, and our purchase and cession from those powers having the pretense of the reality of any right to the same. That beyond these rights, so perfectly established, we would feel compelled to retain the whole territory in accordance with Mr. Monroe's universally approved declaration of 1823, that the American continents were not thenceforth to be considered subjects for any future colonization by any foreign power." The declaration wound up by remonstrating "against the possession of any part of the north-west coast of the Pacific ocean by the power of Great Britain". Copies of the resolutions and declaration were sent to the President, the Governors of the several States, and to each member of Congress. It is obvious that this jumble of "unquestionable title", "manifest destiny", Monroe doctrine and denunciation of the "Blarsted Britishers", was intended for political effect. It was well calculated to appeal to all who sought to better their condition by securing cheap homes, and especially to the bold and adventurous frontiersmen of the West, who were always pushing beyond the outposts of civilization.

President Tyler in his annual message to Congress in December, 1843, declared his opinion, "after the most rigid and, as far as practicable, unbiased examination of the subject", that "the United States have always contended that their rights appertain to the entire region of country lying on the Pacific and embraced between latitude of 42° and 54° 40'."

The controversy got into politics and the national Democratic platform, adopted at Baltimore in 1844, contained a resolution affirming "that our title to the whole of the territory of Oregon is clear and unquestionable;

that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England or any other power, and the re-occupation of Oregon and the re-annexation of Texas, at the earliest practicable period, are great American measures which this convention recommends to the candid support of the Democracy of the Union."

To unite those favoring the annexation of Texas with those favoring the occupation of Oregon would add to the strength of both, and uniting the two objects in one plank of the Democratic platform was what may be called "shrewd politics". During the presidential campaign of 1844 there were no more inspiring rallying cries than those of "All of Oregon or none", and "Fifty-Four Forty or Fight".

After the election of Polk the advocates of the occupation of the whole of Oregon up to 54° 40' at once began to insist that the new administration should redeem its party campaign pledges. In his inaugural address President Polk expressly approved the position of the Democratic National Convention on the Oregon question. He could scarcely have done otherwise, as the position of the Democratic Party on that question had undoubtedly contributed largely to his election.

The President devoted a considerable portion of his annual message of December 2, 1845, to the Oregon question, reviewing the actions of his own and of the preceding administrations upon the subject. In his message he referred to "the extraordinary and wholly inadmissible demands of the British government", and expressed the opinion that "no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected", and that the title of the United States to the whole of Oregon territory "could be maintained by irrefragible facts and arguments", and he advised that Congress consider "what measures it may be proper to adopt for the security and protection of our citizens, now inhabiting, or who may hereafter inhabit,

Oregon, as for the maintenance of our just title to the territory". For this purpose he recommended that "the protection of our laws and our jurisdiction, civil and criminal, ought to be immediately extended over our citizens in Oregon". He also recommended the establishment of stockades and forts and an adequate force of mounted riflemen for the protection of immigrants while on their way to the territory. Continuing, he said that "at the end of the year's notice, should Congress think it proper to make provisions for giving that notice, we shall have reached the period when the national rights in Oregon must either be abandoned or fully maintained. That they cannot be abandoned without a sacrifice of both national honor and interest, is too clear to admit of doubt".

Resolutions looking to the immediate carrying out of the policy announced by the Democratic Baltimore Convention and approved by Polk were introduced in the House by Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois, then Chairman of the House Committee on Territories, and by C. J. Ingersol, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Relations, and in the Senate by Senator Edward A. Hannegan of Indiana.

Prolonged and exciting debates on the Oregon question followed in both houses of Congress which disclosed a very belligerent spirit against Great Britain, especially in the West and Northwest. The general tone of the Democratic press throughout the country was equally belligerent. In the Senate the chief advocates of the administration's Oregon policy were William Allen of Ohio, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Lewis Cass of Michigan, Edward A. Hannegan of Indiana, and David Atchison of Missouri. Conspicuous among the supporters of this policy in the House was Stephen A. Douglas. The most eloquent, and at the same time the most bitter, of all the Fifty-Four Forties was Senator Hannegan. Although born in Ohio, he was of

Irish descent and was animated by a hatred of Great Britain which he made no attempt to conceal. While the excitement in Congress over the Oregon question was at its height, in response to an invitation to attend a meeting of the friends of Vice President Dallas in Philadelphia on January 8, 1846, he sent a letter in which he proposed as a toast, "Oregon — Every foot or not an inch; 54 degrees and forty minutes or *delenda est Britania*", to which the committee replied "The honorable Edward A. Hannegan, the true hearted American Statesman, who truly represented the people on the Oregon question; 'the whole of it or none; Oregon or war'".

Senator Allen of Ohio delivered a long tirade in which he recounted the manifold aggressions and expatiated on the internal weakness of the British Empire, which, he argued, portended its speedy dissolution, and upon the great advantages which the United States would have in case of war between the two nations, and wound up with this extraordinary peroration: "In these things sir, it is, that the strength of our, and the weakness of the British government consists. Ours resting upon the hearts — hers, upon the backs — of the people. What then, have we to do, to secure Oregon? Extend over it our laws. What else have we to do for its defense? Tell the people the truth. Tell them it is their soil. Tell them this, prove it to them — as we have before told them; and before proven it. Tell them that arrogant England — their hereditary enemy, the enemy of all free governments, is seeking to snatch it from them, to fence us out from the Pacific ocean, to belt us about yet more closely with her kingly despotism. Tell them these things and ask them if they will surrender this large part of their country, surrender it to that government which, in two wars employed savages to hack to pieces, in cold blood, the women and children of America, surrender it to that government which hates ours, because it is free — which

envies our people for their happiness, in proportion to the misery of its own. Tell them these things, and ask them if they are ready to surrender this vast territory from the mere dread of invasion by a rabble of armed paupers, threatened to be sent by a bankrupt government, whose whole power of government, whose whole power of the sword and dungeon is required to stifle the cries of famine at home, or to protect its own life against the uplifted hands of starving millions. Tell them these things, ask them if they are ready to make this surrender. Ask the American people this, and they will give you an answer which shall make the British Empire tremble throughout its whole frame and foundation”.

Senator Hannegan of Indiana and Senator Cass of Michigan spoke in much the same strain. Hannegan’s speech on January 24, 1846, was a model of its kind, commonly designated as “spread eagle eloquence”. “Where is your warrant”, he asked, “for ceding away five degrees and a half of Oregon? Where is your warrant for withdrawing the aegis of your constitution and laws from any, even the meanest of your citizens, who may have fixed his habitation on the most remote and sterile points in all your dominions? Is the Senator from South Carolina prepared and willing to transfer any, even though it be the poor pioneer, whose sinewy form first parts the tangled forests to let in upon the eternal solitudes the light of day; from whose rude hut the first smoke of the pale-face curls in the wilderness? Shall Freedom’s Sabbath be no more for him? Far, far, and lonely as he is, he has his domestic altar, and before it God and Freedom are worshipped together. He has his household gods, the names his mother taught him, perhaps in South Carolina, perhaps in Massachusetts, when he, a fair haired boy, played by her side. He has taught in turn and he hears them daily from lisping childhood, and first of these is Washington. Where is the steel clad hand, the iron

heart, that would break down this altar, desecrate this worship, and change upon his children's lips the name of Washington for England's Queen? Rather, were that hut mine, should its fire go out forever rather, far rather, should the serpent wind its devious way among the lifeless bodies of the best loved of my heart, to coil and hiss unharmed upon the hearthstone. . . . But it is not the West alone that forbids it. History, speaking from the sepulchre of the sainted dead, forbids it. The shades of Washington, of Adams, of Henry, of the whole host of revolutionary sires, forbid it. A still small voice from Lexington and Concord forbids it. The holy blood which ran in torrents on the parched fields of Monmouth and Brandywine and Camden forbids it. All the past — the spectre form of the past with mournful looks — forbid it. The present forbids it. Seven-tenths of the American people forbid it. The future with one long-continued, stern, unbroken front forbids it. By all the past glory of our country, and in the name of posterity, of the unborn millions, whose fortune it shall be to direct free and proud America on her high destiny, I protest against the dismemberment of her territory, the abandonment of her interests, and the sacrifice of her honor, before any and every altar of earth, but especially and above all others, before the altar of English ambition''.

Great Britain had not been unmindful of what was going on in the United States in reference to Oregon and was now in fighting mood. A British warship was ordered to the Oregon coast and arrangements were made for a military reconnoissance of the territory in order to be better prepared for war, if war should ensue. The gravity of the situation was now apparent to the thinking people of both Great Britain and the United States. Sober-minded persons in this country now realized that the controversy over Oregon had passed beyond the domain of party politics, and that it must be settled by

other arguments than those that had been heard in stump speeches in the presidential campaign. It was also realized that a halt must be called in the headlong policy of the administration, and a curbing of the impetuosity of the Fifty-Four Forties, or that the inevitable result would be war with Great Britain, and that at no distant time.

War with Great Britain at any time was quite another business from war with Mexico, and Great Britain had never been better prepared for war over Oregon than she was then. She was mistress of the seas; she had no foreign wars on hand of any consequence; she could reach Oregon by sea or land, far more easily and quickly than could the United States. The United States had then only about 5,000 miles of railroad, all told; there were no roads of any kind suitable for transporting men and munitions of war to Oregon; there was no navy fit to cope with that of Great Britain and what few vessels there were would have been compelled to make a long and difficult voyage around Cape Horn in order to reach the Oregon coast. The damage to the commerce of the country in the event of war with Great Britain was evident; the probable damage to the cotton industry of the South was not overlooked; nor was the probability of an alliance between Great Britain and Mexico in the event of war with the latter, then imminent, unheeded.

The more the matter was discussed in Congress, the more clearly did it appear that the claim of title of the United States to the line of 54° 40' rested upon very flimsy foundations. This was shown by Senator Benton of Missouri in an elaborate and exhaustive discussion of the question in a speech in the Senate. Senator Reverdy Johnson of Maryland also made a strong speech in accord with Benton's. Webster, Calhoun, and other able statesmen in Congress, while not going so far as Benton, were nevertheless of the opinion that the claim of the

Fifty-Four Forties was too doubtful to justify the risk of war to maintain it.

Considering the whole matter carefully, sober-minded statesmen foresaw the probability that, in case of war, this country instead of gaining "all of Oregon or none" would probably lose it all; that an alliance between Great Britain and Mexico would bring war to the very threshold of the South; and, if so, that there would be more danger of losing Texas than there would be probability of acquiring additional territory from Mexico.

For months the whole country was in a state of feverish suspense and anxiety. There were other considerations that, although not openly expressed, undoubtedly had great influence with the Southern leaders. An unsuccessful war with Great Britain would be disastrous to all who advocated it, and might possibly be extremely so to the South. On the other hand, suppose that, in the event of war, the United States should succeed in acquiring all of the Oregon territory; its soil and climate were not adapted to slave labor; its inhabitants were opposed to slavery; and the result would be more free States and more Senators and Representatives in Congress hostile to slavery.

Such harangues as those of Hannegan and Allen, however effective they may have been at the hustings, had little weight with the Senate and called forth several caustic responses, the most significant of which came from the Southern members of Congress.

Senator Crittenden of Kentucky denied that there was any good reason "why two nations and the world should be set to war and to cut each other's throats". Senator Berrien of Georgia said that "a bloody hand is not the only symbol of a nation's honor", and that in case of war with Great Britain we should be prepared to meet "a strong man armed", and not exaggerate our capacity "to extract sunbeams out of cucumbers of which the pro-

cess is difficult; or what is equivalent, to make men of war out of packet ships". William Y. Yancy, a member of the House from Alabama, afterwards characterized as the "Prince of Fire Eaters", after referring to the territory which the United States had acquired by peaceful means, "more magnificent in domain, more pregnant with national grandeur, than any the blood-dripping eagles of imperial Rome ever flew over in their conquering and devastating career", deprecated the fact that he saw around him "crowds of American statesmen yearning to break this mighty and glorious spell; whose hearts are panting for war; whose hands itch to grasp the sword, whose feet are raised to trample the olive branch; whose every impulse is to grapple with England to decide by the terrible law of arms a territorial right".

Calhoun was in favor of a "wise and masterly inactivity", until we should be better prepared for war, if war must come, and was in favor of peaceful negotiations, believing that by precipitancy we might lose all instead of gaining all of Oregon.

In the progress of the discussions in Congress, there was a singular shifting of party lines. Polk might naturally have expected, and probably did expect, the support of his own party, and especially the support of the Democratic Southern leaders. But most of the Southern Democrats, following the lead of Calhoun and Benton, opposed the administration's Oregon policy. On the other hand general surprise was created by the course of the venerable ex-President, John Quincy Adams, who made an elaborate speech in support of the claim of all of Oregon up to the line of $54^{\circ} 40'$. He said that "there would be no war in his opinion, even if we persevered in these measures, and that what he most feared was that our rights would be sacrificed by the backing out of the administration and its supporters".

Stranger still was the position of Joshua R. Gid-

dings, the well known Abolition member of the House from Ohio. Giddings made a remarkable speech on January 5, 1846. Referring to the zeal and the warlike spirit with which the Southern leaders had advocated the annexation of Texas, and contrasting this with the mild and conciliatory tone in which they discussed the Oregon question and their apparent reluctance to adopt any policy that might lead to war with Great Britain, he taunted them by insinuating that they had acted in bad faith towards their Northern allies, and, that, having secured the annexation of Texas, they were now ready to desert them or let them fight the battle for Oregon alone. "They now see", he said, "difficulties before them; dangers present themselves to the further pursuit of their plan of territorial aggrandizement. They have suddenly called to mind the declaration of British statesmen, that, 'a war with the United States will be a war of emancipation'.

"They see in prospect the black regiments of the British West India Islands landing among them and their slaves flocking to the enemy's standard. Servile insurrections torment their imaginations; rapine, blood and murder dance before their affrighted visions. They are now seen in every part of the hall, calling on Whigs and Democrats to save them from the dreadful consequences of their own policy. Well, sir, I reply to them, this is your policy, not ours; you have forced us into it against our will, you have prepared the poisoned chalice and we will press it to your lips until you swallow the very dregs". Giddings, like Adams, did not believe that there would be any war with England, and gave his reasons in these sarcastic but prophetic words: "But, Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling to resume my seat until I express my perfect conviction that this policy cannot be carried out by the party in power. The northern Democrats will soon be deserted by their southern slave holding allies.

"They have been betrayed by the slave power. Texas

is admitted, and the southern wing of the Democratic party will now desert their northern friends, and leave Oregon where it is. They are like the militia captain who, when going into battle, informed his men, that, as he was lame, he would commence his retreat then; but his soldiers, being quick upon the foot, he thought they could overtake him if they waited until after the battle. If this resolution should be adopted, the Executive would find means to escape from the dilemma into which this southern policy has precipitated him. It is most obvious to my judgment that he cannot be driven into a war with England. As I have already stated, a war with that nation must prove the total overthrow of slavery. Every reflecting statesman must see this clearly as any event may be foretold by human perception. I do not think the slaveholding portion of the Democratic party were aware that the carrying out of their Baltimore resolutions would sacrifice that institution. They rather believed that by obtaining Texas, the price of human flesh would be enhanced and slavery supported. The consequences of seizing upon the 'whole of Oregon', were not considered. Mr. Polk in his inaugural address and in his annual message evidently overlooked the momentous effect which his twice declared policy would produce upon the slave interest to which he was indissolubly wedded. He, and his cabinet and his party, have made a fatal blunder. They will soon discover their error and will recede from their position. With the same degree of confidence that I have in my own existence, I declare that they will, before the nation and the world, back out from their avowed policy, and will surrender up all that portion of Oregon north of the 49th parallel of latitude, or let the subject remain as it is now. I wish to place this prediction on record for future reference. Nor would I confine my remarks to the Democratic party. Those southern slave-holding Whigs, who voted for Texas will now, if necessary, turn around and vote to

give up part of Oregon. It is a question between the slave states and the free states and the votes when taken will, with few exceptions, exhibit that character. . . . Yes sir, should this resolution pass both houses of Congress the President will find the means to give up a part of Oregon, or even the whole of it, rather than subject the institution of slavery to the sure destruction which a war with England would bring. I again repeat what I have endeavored to impress upon the gentlemen, that this policy is not mine, I wash my hands of it. I feel a deep and abiding conviction, that, if carried out, it will inevitably overthrow our government and dissolve the Union; but these consequences will be retarded by a continuation of the policy, rather than by leaving the government to the slave power, as it now is. By carrying out the policy it will place the northern and southern portions of the Union upon terms approximating to equality. And when from its broad extent this Republic, like the Roman Empire, shall fall asunder of its own weight, the free states will redeem and purify themselves from the foul disgrace of supporting an institution hated of men and cursed of God''.

It is probable that both Adams and Giddings were looked upon by the Southern leaders in the light of "gift-bearing Greeks''. Giddings's speech in particular, though professedly in support of the President's policy, did far more to condemn it in the eyes of the Southern leaders than any speech he could have made in direct opposition to it.

Senator Hannegan, speaking from a standpoint entirely different from that of Giddings, dwelt upon the fact that in the speeches of the Southern members upon the Oregon question there was an entire absence of the belligerent tone that characterized their speeches in favor of the annexation of Texas, and he charged them with Punic faith in having deserted and betrayed their allies in the West and Northwest who had aided them in securing the

annexation of Texas. "There had been", he said, "a singular course pursued on this Oregon question, and with reference to which he must detain the Senate a moment. It contrasted so strongly, so wonderfully, with a precisely similar question — the annexation of Texas. Texas and Oregon were born the same instant, nursed and cradled in the same cradle — the Baltimore Convention — and they were at the same instant adopted by the Democracy throughout the land. There was not a moment's hesitation until Texas was admitted; but the moment she was admitted the peculiar friends of Texas turned, and were doing all they could to strangle Oregon; but the country was not blind or deaf. The people see, they comprehend, and he trusted they would speak. It was a most singular state of things. We were told that we must be careful not to involve ourselves with a war with England on a question of disputed boundary. There was a question of disputed boundary between us and Mexico; but did we hear from the same quarter, any warnings against a collision with Mexico, when we were about to consummate the annexation of Texas. We were told by those who knew something of these matters that the Nueces was the proper boundary of Texas; and how did they find the friends of Texas moving on that occasion? Did we, for a single instant, halt on the banks of the Nueces? No, at a single bound we crossed the Nueces, and the blasts of our trumpets and the prancing of our war horses were heard on the banks of the Rio Del Norte one hundred miles beyond. Nearly one hundred miles of disputed territory gives no cause for a moment's hesitation. There was no negotiation then, so far as Mexico was concerned; we took all. But when Oregon is brought into question we are called on, as an act proper and right, to give away a whole empire on the Pacific coast if England desires it. He never would consent to a surrender of any portion of the country north of 49°, nor one foot by treaty or otherwise under 54° 40'."

But the tide had already begun to set strongly against the policy of the Fifty-Four Forties. The Senate refused to adopt the joint resolution for notice to Great Britain as passed by the House, and it was modified so as to relieve it of its abruptness by inserting a pacific preamble. The joint resolution, so modified, passed in the House on April 18, 1846, by a decided vote of 144 to 40. The President at once gave the notice and the country now breathed easier, relieved, for the time being, of the pressure of suspense that for months had hung over it while confronted with imminent danger of war.

Although Great Britain and the United States had been brought to the verge of war by the policy of the Polk administration and the reckless course of the Fifty-Four Forties, negotiations between the two nations had not ceased, and after the notice given by the administration, they were diligently pursued, the United States being represented by James Buchanan, Secretary of State. Whatever else may be said of him it must be confessed that for such business he was admirably adapted and equipped.

It was plain, as it had been all along, that Great Britain would never concede any of the disputed territory north of the 49th parallel, but Buchanan thought that she might be willing to compromise on that parallel as the boundary line, and he so advised the President. To compromise on that line, would, of course, be a backdown for the administration from the policy unequivocally declared by the Baltimore Democratic platform and as unequivocally advocated by Polk in his inaugural address and in his annual message. But that was the most that could be gotten from Great Britain without war, and the President's advisers deemed it wiser to back down from that indefensible, or, at least, very doubtful claim, than it was to risk the hazards of war in attempting to maintain it. Finally, Polk himself, if not converted to the wisdom, yielded to the necessity, of abandoning his former Oregon policy.

The next thing to do was to break the news of the President's change of policy to the Senate and to the country, but to do this in such a way as to let the President down as easily as possible. For this purpose Senator Haywood of North Carolina, a personal and political friend of the President, was enlisted in his behalf. It was the mission of Haywood not only to announce the President's change of policy, but to show that he was not guilty of any inconsistency. This, of course, was a difficult if not an impossible undertaking, but Haywood performed it as well as anyone else could have done in a speech in the Senate on March 6, 1846.

Haywood's speech excited the ire of Hannegan and Allen, who at once demanded to know whether Haywood spoke by the authority of the President or not, but Haywood avoided giving a direct answer, although we have Benton's word for it that he was so authorized. Then Hannegan, pretending to believe that Haywood had spoken without the authority of the President, proceeded to show, and to show very clearly, by extracts from the President's messages, that his present policy, if it was that attributed to him by Haywood, was altogether inconsistent with that formerly advocated by him. Going still further, he proceeded to exhaust his stock of invectives in berating the President over Haywood's shoulders for an abandonment of his political principles and for treason to his party.

"In plain words", he said, "he [Haywood] represents the President as parenthetically sticking in a few hollow and false words to cajole the ultraisms of the country. What is this, need I ask, but charging upon the President conduct the most vile and infamous. If this allegation be true, the intentions of the President must sooner or later come to light, and, when brought to light, what must follow but irretrievable disgrace? So long as one human eye remains to linger on the page of history

the story of his abasement will be read, sending him and his name together to an infamy so profound, a damnation so deep, that the hand of resurrection will never be able to drag him forth. He who is a traitor to his country can never have forgiveness of God, and cannot ask mercy of man." Continuing, he said: "I have only to add, that, so far as the whole tone, spirit, and meaning of the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina are concerned, if they speak the language of James K. Polk, James K. Polk has spoken words of falsehood, and with the tongue of a serpent."

Benton found in some ancient precedents a way in which to extricate the President from his embarrassment. The proposition of the British government was submitted to the Senate for its advice, and Benton interviewed the Whig Senators, and ascertained that they would favor a treaty based on that proposition. The Senate voted advising the President to accept the proposition. A treaty was contracted accordingly and approved by the Senate. The Democratic papers at Washington and elsewhere raised a great outcry, but by this loud cannonading of the rear guard, all that was intended was to cover the retreat of the President and the Democratic Party which had assumed the character of a stampede. So ended the long controversy over the Oregon boundary question.

As Giddings had predicted there had been a complete backdown by the administration from its original Oregon policy. The Fifty-Four Forties did not get "all of Oregon". They did not get a "fight". They got only so much of Oregon as Great Britain was willing to concede and no more, but their Southern allies had gained the annexation of Texas — all that they cared for, all that they had fought for in the preceding presidential campaign. Another great area was now added to the vast territorial domain of the United States in which the status of slavery was yet to be settled.

FREEDOM OF TEACHING IN HISTORY

BY HERRIOTT CLARE PALMER

Presenting a paper upon the subject of "Freedom of Teaching in History" before such a body of history teachers is suggested in part at least by the circumstances of one year ago — familiar doubtless to us all — attending the resignation of Professor Enoch Marvin Banks from the University of Florida, where he occupied the Chair of History and Economics. We recall that Professor Banks, a Southerner by birth and in part by education, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of secession wrote for *The Independent* an article entitled "A Semi-Centennial View of Secession". Because of views expressed therein, a member of the Florida legislature, too ignorant to appreciate Professor Banks's scholarly approach to his subject and too narrow to see the large results to the South of such a generous policy, wrote to *The Independent* denouncing the professor for his position, threatened the paper, appealed to the Florida press and to Southern patriotism, and finally demanded of the State Legislature that the professor be removed as one guilty of treason and unworthy to teach the history and the political theories of the South to the South. Lest the legislature reduce the appropriations to the University because of his continued presence, Professor Banks resigned.

The case was a clear one of the suppression of the freedom of speech and the freedom of that teaching which Professor Banks believed to be the truth concerning the history of the South in the period immediately preceding the Civil War. Mr. Andrew Sledd, ex-president of the same University, writes of the incident as an illustration

of the unfortunate conditions which limit educational freedom in the South. He says: "Freedom of speech and freedom of teaching is vague in the south, a sort of academic myth concocted by impractical and visionary men and failures." To us of the North the action belongs with the heresy trials in the deliberations of some of our churches, with censure and sometimes dismissal for so called heterodox teachings in theological schools, and with the criticisms for teachings in some of our colleges and universities which insist upon the expression of truth and honesty in politics and economics whatever the source of the support of the institution. Suppression of freedom of teaching by government action is characteristic of Russia's Tzar twenty years ago, and as free-speaking Teutonic peoples we are reverted in history two centuries and are compelled to plead with Milton "for liberty to know, to utter and to argue freely according to conscience and this is liberty above all liberties."

The article by Professor Banks may be fairly interpreted, as it was, as an acknowledgment of his belief that the South was mistaken in 1860 in the position which it assumed upon the questions of slavery and secession. He also expressed his belief that "the South is becoming more tolerant of free discussion of its past and present policies and is paving the way for a liberal intellectual life. This new spirit of liberality toward opposing views, when expressed with sincerity is perhaps the greatest incipient triumph of the twentieth century South." Doubtless it was this to which the accusers took exception. They object to acknowledge ever having been in the wrong or to have any one do it for them.

To acknowledge it is certainly an honest and a brave thing to have done, but to my mind, if I interpret Professor Banks's article correctly, an appreciation of that acknowledgment is but an outward and superficial appreciation of the real thing he intended to do, of the

larger contributions which he made to historical interpretation.

In a letter to ex-president Sledd, he says: "I wrote the article in all good faith and with an honest desire to make some contribution toward promoting a liberal intellectual life here in the South. I am disposed to think that our political leaders, teachers, preachers, editors, and others in positions of more or less influence, made a serious and grievous mistake in the generation prior to the Civil War in not setting in motion influences that would have paved the way for the gradual removal of slavery from our country without the loss of so many lives, without the expenditure of so much treasure, without the bitterness of reconstruction, and without the subsequent pension burden. Now, if I censure them, in a sense, for failing to measure up to the demands of the age in which they lived, can I excuse myself from making the attempt, to the extent of my ability and equipment, to set in motion influences in my limited sphere that would tend to liberate our minds and thus prepare the way for the solution of the present problems of our civilization and progress, problems indeed which are hardly less urgent and difficult than were those of our fathers prior to the sixties?"

The article itself is a setting forth, in the light of the estimate placed upon slavery and in the light of the history of political theories and of those held by the South, of her reason for secession. The South, because slavery was her peculiar economic heritage, failed to see that in the nineteenth century it was an obsolete institution. Other nations, such as England and France, had entered upon policies of emancipation in the early decade of the century and the Northern position was merely in harmony with the dictates of an advanced civilization. Southern leaders, under influences of apparent pecuniary and social interests failed to understand this tendency

and to enter upon the work of formulating plans for harmonizing its policies with the currents of world progress. To maintain such an institution the South was led to attach exaggerated importance to the doctrine of State sovereignty and to revive a political science that was becoming obsolete. A belief in the theory of nationalism or of the evolutionary idea of the state would have led them in their thinking to a position which would cause the North, so they feared, by national right to interfere with their institution of slavery. Moreover, Southern statesmen, even Alexander Stephens, who argued long against his State seceding, believed in secession as a constitutional right from 1789, in the theory of compact government, and that a union of States severally sovereign was the best form of union. The notion of an evolutionary order of things in morals, in government, and in all manner of social institutions is an idea that was by no means as familiar to them as it is to us of the twentieth century; nettled as they were by outside pressure and in many cases by undue criticism, they more and more concentrated their efforts in support of an antiquated order of things in morals and economy, and finally waged a four years' war with unsurpassed heroism and devotion in support of an equally antiquated order of things in government. Thus secession as an act of the South is shown to be but the natural consequence of her adherence to the political policy of contract government. That it was a mistaken act and a mistaken policy was proven by subsequent history; and had the South not been blinded by her adherence to slavery, she might so have appreciated it.

Professor Banks was writing only of the South and of Southern conditions. Had he been writing of the North, while he must have acknowledged her advancement to the position of a belief in nationalism and the non-extension of slavery, he must also have told of the difficult struggle on the part of nationalism for existence.

The State was formed and the Constitution was adopted upon the theory of contract government. Throughout the nineteenth century court decisions were rendered upon the basis of the theory of a divided sovereignty. Calhoun, though he taught that sovereignty rested with the State, was the first theorist who reached the safe basis of its indivisibility. Even Webster, the first champion of the nationalistic school, sustained his theory of an indivisibility of sovereignty upon the basis of constitutional law. The Constitution had made the union; it must not be broken. Calhoun formed his belief, and it was the belief of the South, in the relation of the Commonwealths as it had existed when the Union was formed. Webster found his belief, and it was the belief of the North, in the political conditions as they had developed by the middle of the century and as they were further developing.

Not all of the North thought with Webster that secession was impossible. Horace Greeley's editorial of November 9, 1860, in the *New York Tribune*, the foremost Republican organ, led the other Republican papers with the following declaration: "We hold, with Jefferson, to the inalienable rights of communities to alter or abolish forms of government that have become oppressive or injurious; and, if the cotton states shall decide that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. The right to secede may be a revolutionary right, but it exists nevertheless; and we do not see how one party can have a right to do what another party has the right to prevent. We must ever resist the right of any state to remain in the Union and nullify or defy the laws thereof; to withdraw from the Union is quite another matter. And whenever a considerable section of our Union shall deliberately resolve to go out we shall resist all coercive measures designed to keep her in. We hope never to live in a Republic whereof one section is pinned to the residue by bayonets."

The political theory of the nationalist school, North or South, did not work itself out until after the war had settled the question as to the real nature of the Union. Moreover, the theories of the later nationalistic school were very different from those of the earlier. With the former the State was constitutionally formed; with the latter it was of historical or evolutionary growth. The latter found the sovereignty, which was the essential element of the State, back of the Constitution in the people themselves, and the State had developed with the political consciousness of the people and had become an indivisible Union with the development of the rational like-mindedness of the people. Lincoln, prophet-eyed, was asserting the later nationalistic theory when he asserted that the State was of historical growth and that the Union was older than the Constitution. He was conscious of the power of the people as the creating source of the Constitution when he said: "measures otherwise unconstitutional might become lawful by becoming indispensable to the preservation of the Constitution, through the preservation of the Nation." If only constitutionally created the Union could not have existed previous to the Constitution, and history would not have substantiated Lincoln. It was only in the evolutionary sense that this was true. In 1866 J. A. Jameson began to distinguish constitutions as organic growths from constitutions as instruments of evidences; back of all the States, and of all forms of government for either the States or the Union, we are to conceive of the nation, a body politic, one and indivisible. By 1870 Mulford distinguished between the historical constitution and the enacted constitution, the one the result of the nation's historical development, the other prescribed by law.

To say that the South was sluggish in its political thinking; that it held to the obsolete theory of contract government, State sovereignty, and secession, and was

consequently what we call mistaken; that the North was alert in its political thinking, was conscious of the movement toward nationalism in the United States which was paralleled in the world's politics as evidenced in the unifying of Germany and Italy and was what we call right, is simply the effort to tell the truth in the light of subsequent history and according to one's rational judgment after fifty years. The privilege to tell the truth in teaching history is the old plea of Milton for the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue. It corresponds to Cicero's primary law in historical writing which he defined as "the power to refrain from accepting any thing which is false, and not to ignore any thing which is true." The viewpoint of history, the end of which is to eliminate the false and to recognize the truth so far as it lieth in us, is the only viewpoint in the teaching of history. It is that which recognizes a measure of truth and falsity perhaps together and is willing to consider all sides of a question to find the truth. It is that viewpoint which leads the teacher of history born of parents of one generation of Southern slaveholders who saw the wrong in the institution, freed their slaves and came North, or of another later generation who were abolitionists when it was no especial honor to be abolitionists, to honestly recognize and teach the mistakes of reconstruction. It is the freedom to do that that we ask for, and it is the doing of it that we claim is teaching history. The despised policy of the despised Johnson may appeal to some of us as equally scientific and as far less dangerous than the policy of Congress in reconstruction, with its necessity for military control in time of declared peace, and the miseries and disgraces of carpet-bag rule and negro domination. It is teaching history to show, whatever the democratic theory of manhood suffrage, or the theory of the necessity for securing to the negro political rights in order to secure to him his civil rights, the disastrous results from imme-

diate and universal negro enfranchisement and to recognize that it was the effort of the Republican Party to secure its permanent control of the reconstructed States that granted that franchise. I believe that the principles of democracy were violated to a far greater extent through the interference of a radical Republican Congress with the South in its early efforts to conform to the plan of reconstruction and to adjust the freedman to the society of which he himself formed a part, than if the South had been allowed to meet her own problems of new governments for her States and of laws for the freed negroes and this in the light of the criticised vagrancy — apprentice laws. In spite of the well intentioned democratic theories, it is reasonable that the South understood the negro better than the North could. History must recognize the undoing of reconstruction and the demoralizing effect of the disfranchising of the negro, contrary to the promises of reconstruction and in spite of the constitutional law made to secure to him his so-called rights.

It is the viewpoint of history that attempts to find the truth which might teach the American Revolution to American and English students alike. From the juristic standpoint the American student must recognize the right of the English Parliament to make and execute the laws which she attempted and that some of our honored forefathers were smugglers and otherwise violaters of law. From the standpoint of principles of ethnic and geographic conditions, the English student must recognize that a new state was in the process of evolution and if England with her obsolete ideas and methods of representation and of state making, failed to see this, a revolution was inevitable. A teacher in a New York high school came into a seminar in the American Revolution one morning to present a paper on the formation of State government in one of the Carolinas. In a brief paper, he set forth the conditions within the Colony from the

American viewpoint, the right of revolution, and the circumstances of the new State government. When the paper was completed the professor in charge asked if he had found no material from the English standpoint. He very frankly replied: "I did not wish to find any."

I have a young friend who graduated with us last year, whose mother is a Canadian, whose father is an American, and who himself was born in China. Until sixteen years old, when he came to America to be educated, he attended an English school in the city of Chefoo, under English control and attended by English and American boys. There was a custom in that school, not interfered with by its authorities, that on the Fourth of July the English boys whipped the American boys. So much a custom was it that it became a habit for the American boys, who were fewer and usually smaller than the English, to stay away on that day. Finally, on one Fourth, the American youngsters got together upon a plan and generously thrashed the English. He told me the story in connection with his description of the kind of history he was taught. He said: "Until I came to America I had no conception of American history so far as anything I had gotten from my teachers was concerned and the thought that history was the truth concerning a movement, that there might be an English and an American standpoint, and that the truth was the substance of all the evidence that could be brought to bear upon the subject was not thought of."

Very much is being said at present by some of our writers and teachers of historical criticism concerning what they term "the new history". We have a new psychology, a new education, and must have a "new history". It is to be hoped that it will not be written so large as the other two. It is refreshing to learn, however, that there is a "new history"; in fact it is consoling to find that, in the light of the encroachments of all the new sciences that

have developed for the study of man and society, there is any history or any field for history left. As critics of the history of the past have been in doubt as to its meaning, and as it has been assigned numbers of definitions, so too the new history comes to us with a variety of meanings. There is the thought that the history of the present day differs decidedly from former history in its scope, intention, and character. Where, as formerly, history, judging from the materials selected by historians in its writing, was narrow in its scope, was in fact confined to the cataloguing of names and places, to a mere chronological order of political events, and these with military affairs were given disproportionate emphasis, the new history has been found to be anything which has to do with the life of a man in the past, that general culture is the field for the selection of history material, and the sources of information have been found to extend from the farthest finds of the archæologist to the morning newspaper. A second interpretation which is held to be new is found in its method. In the consideration and selection of material for history, the approach is the critical, the scientific; the end sought by the historian is what I have tried to suggest above as being to find the truth.

Neither of these meanings is new to us in the light of the work of the present generation of historians. Both are the product of nineteenth century thought. We have all had at least some appreciation of the scope and intent of history and have appreciated the meaning of and the attitude in the scientific approach. If there is a new history, and we are willing to concede that there is, it is in the light of the entire history of the meaning and the development of historical research and writing.

Almost if not quite up to the nineteenth century, history had been largely traditional in character. There was the literary history which sought to tell a story which

would interest or instruct and which affected a literary style. There was the theological school of historians who approached their work as theological interpreters of any subject usually approach it; that is, they came with certain preconceived notions as to history and as to God's place in it, and then proceeded to prove these notions in the facts they found. Through the works of both of these schools there ran the questions which have always interested the student of society: What is the ultimate end of history? What will be the outcome of the efforts of men? For what was man and society created? This gave rise to that much criticised phase of history known as the philosophy of history. It was criticised not for any lack of value or interest in the question, nor for much that was scholarly in the answers that were made, and it yet remains a question for much consideration, but it was criticised for the conspicuous absence of any history and because the results were the work of philosophers rather than that of historians. They sought to establish laws, prove principles, and make generalizations — and to do this rather from the standpoint of preconceived principles than from discovered facts.

All of these forms of history were traditional rather than rational; they were the result of popular belief, of impulse and opinion rather than the result of reason and judgment. The historians were not only not critical in their attitude toward their own researches and in the selection of their material, but they were ignorant of the law of present day sociology, for the determination of constituent results which is as applicable to the study of society of the past as to the study of society of the present. The law states that the development of social constitution depends upon the growth of an appreciation of the value of variety or unlikeness in society. Translate this law into the vocabulary of history and we find that the discovery of truth concerning society of the past, from

the materials of history, depends upon the growth of an appreciation of the value of variety and unlikeness among these materials. Mere traditional like-mindedness is the result of mere sympathetic like-mindedness. Rational like-mindedness comes only after the struggle of variety and unlikenesses have worked themselves back to a rational judgment. Goodness is defined in sociology as that quality of an act or event which is the result of rational judgment rather than the result of impulse or desire. Is not that which we call truth in historical research and discovery to be similarly determined?

With the early part of the nineteenth century the critical approach in the study of history was developed in the work of Von Ranke. He criticised the traditional history as untrustworthy, and ridiculed both historian and politician who sought to support their facts by their theories. History according to Ranke could be written only from the most genuine documents and "my object", he said, "is simply to find out how things actually were."

In the middle of the nineteenth century the entire world of thought was revolutionized by the discoveries in natural science. In the light of the work of Darwin and the evolutionists of the natural world, history took a more distinct scientific method and the world of man as a social as well as a physical product was thought of as evolutionary. Historians became more critical of their sources, and materials were subjected to severer tests. It was then that history began to be discussed as a science, and there came into existence other social and political sciences more or less closely allied with history.

I shall not attempt to determine the meaning of the science of history to this audience; it would be useless. Moreover, the meanings are perhaps as numerous and even more widely separated than the definitions of history itself or of "new history". In the light of my very

meager knowledge of the work of Ranke, I would be inclined to define the science of history simply as a method of approach in the discovery of facts, events, and laws in history. In the light of the discoveries of Darwin and of the thought of all things as being evolutionary, I am inclined to define it as the effort to discover the process, perhaps the law, by which man has developed in his relation to other men in history and to discover these in society as a whole. Professor George Burton Adams would make this conception at least very like a return to the old question of the philosophy of history. Professor James Harvey Robinson would make it something entirely new and would say that it is a real science of history. Professor Richards, in his work on *German Civilization*, says in defining the work imposed by history upon the twentieth century: "it will be seen what an important part history, in its modern conception as the history of civilization, is destined to play in the future; indeed, a no less ambitious aim is placed before the historical investigation than the establishment of the laws of social evolution." This is not new with Professor Richards; and while it sounds exceedingly interesting, it sounds to some of us very like the old question of the philosophy of history in the language of the discoveries of modern science.

Moreover, while we are not ready to hand over with Dr. Robinson to the "Allies of History" all of the credit for all of the advance which should have been made by history within the field of social science, we question if this discovery prophesied by Dr. Richards is not the work of the sociologist rather than that of the historian. While the historian undoubtedly had for his own the field of the study of society in the past, before either the sociologist or the archæologist intruded, is there not yet a distinct field for the historian? The historian has the right to appropriate to his own work all of the results

of the discoveries in the field of natural science. He should honor and appreciate the work of the archæologist, the anthropologist, the sociologist, and even the animal psychologist, in throwing light upon the discoveries in history. He may find the greatest delight and profit in teaching history as the account of man and society in the great evolutionary processes of the world, but does not his work still remain the labor of finding and recording things as they are? He furnishes the truth upon which the philosophers and scientists of society make their generalizations.

Our plea for freedom of teaching in history is a conservative plea and one which is found in the very nature of history itself as it is understood to-day. It is simply that, with a scientific approach to the material, we be allowed to tell of things as we find them and that the telling be in the light of rational thought. If we are to set forth truth as we find it, we must go untrammelled by criticism. For petty politicians or legislatures or theological schools or endowers of universities to attempt to criticise teachers of history or teachers of any social science for their expression of what they believe to be true, and to attempt to prevent them from such expression, is to revert in the history of history and proves usually that, whatever the advance toward a science of history in which rational judgment is to hold sway, there still remain critics belonging to that ancient régime which was dominated by tradition.

A final plea for freedom of teaching in history I would make, and it also is to be made in the light of the nature of the subject. If the method of history teaching is scientific and the content is truth and these consequently demand freedom in statement, the problems of present day society are to be solved largely in the light of truth discovered. History teaching fails in its value if it fails to make its application to present day conditions.

I do not mean that we find examples or precepts in the past which the present needs or desires to follow. I mean that the present, and the end it has in view, can be comprehended in its fullness only in the knowledge of how it came to be. The student of society finds his fund of illustration for understanding social principles in the occurrences of the past. The greatest contribution which history can make to the present is to describe how men's judgments have been developed, changed, and rationalized. Present social institutions are liberal just in proportion as they are of rational development. They are coercive in proportion as they are the result of impulse and opinion.

A truthful reading of history in its making is an essential for social betterment. Frankness and fearlessness in speech, outspoken denunciation of certain evils or open support in denial of false charges are some of the needs of society at the present time. Habits of recognizing and expressing truth in historical research, freedom of opinion and honesty of expression as to the past insure habits of truth and freedom of opinion with regard to the present.

Professor Hart in his address before the American Historical Association in 1909 on the subject of "Imagination in History" asked this question: "Is there no penal code for those who undertake to write history out of something other than the records, to gloss the truth with a quality of mind which is outside the events themselves?" "It is the duty", he adds, "of a sober and studious body like the American Historical Association to dwell upon the strictly scientific character of history, to emphasize the fixed principles of research, to warn the world of unsound study and writing of history. The remedy is a matter of method and process and point of view."

We would make his question to read: Is there no

penal code for those who seek to prevent, by their traditional viewpoint and their bigotry of opinion, those who would write and teach history as they have found it from the records, and who desire to present the truth within the limits of the events?

TEACHING HISTORY BY TYPE STUDIES

BY CHARLES ALEXANDER McMURRY

Our present course of study in United States history, as illustrated by text-books in common use, is overloaded with the quantity and variety of facts and material. The grammar school text-books have from four hundred and fifty to five hundred pages of closely written, condensed historical material, with more or less illustrative pictures. In the time allowed for history in the seventh and eighth grades, it is impossible to give these numerous topics an adequate treatment so as to make them intelligible and interesting to children. The concentration of historical studies in the grammar grades upon a few central organizing topics (sometimes called type studies) is proposed as a relief for this depressing condition. It is proposed to reduce greatly the number of topics handled in grammar grades, and to give a far richer concrete and illustrative treatment of those few important topics which are selected. The difficulty of handling so many topics adequately is well illustrated by an examination of a few of our standard text-books.

The organization of historical material around a single controlling idea is well illustrated by the topic, the "Virginia Plantation", where a great variety of facts in Colonial history, not only in Virginia but in all the Southern Colonies, is interpreted in a fruitful manner by grouping around this central topic. This method of treating an important topic is very simple and falls under two heads: (1) the full description of the simple type offered (Virginia Plantation); and (2) comparisons with other Colonies in the South, and contrasts with conditions in New England.

The number of topics which should be treated in this way is quite small — not more than ten or fifteen important topics in a year's work. For example, during a year's work in the Colonial period, the following list could be offered:

- (1) The Virginia Plantation
- (2) Bacon's Rebellion
- (3) Government in Massachusetts — Development of Town-meeting and General Court
- (4) Governor Andros as an Illustration of Royal Governors
- (5) Early Dutch Settlements at New Amsterdam
- (6) The Iroquois Indians
- (7) The Life of Penn
- (8) Life of Benjamin Franklin during the Colonial Period
- (9) The Last French War — Montcalm and Wolfe
- (10) Ship-building and Commerce in New England during the Colonial Period.

A number of arguments might be offered against this concentration upon a few topics: (1) it does not cover the ground of American history sufficiently, and consequently many of the common facts might not come into view; (2) it does not prepare properly for ordinary examinations and tests in American history; (3) children can not well appreciate these large topics, for they need first to know the facts of history; (4) teachers can not use such a plan because they have not been trained to it, and the prevailing text-books do not follow it.

But the arguments in favor of concentration upon a few central type studies are quite as convincing. (1) a reorganization of the course of study in history is necessary, since the present course is impossible of proper treatment; (2) organization of facts upon central ideas greatly simplifies historical study and makes it intelligible and interesting; (3) the important facts of history

are more easily learned and remembered when thus organized than when learned in such disconnected form as is usual; (4) the fundamental demand is for a far richer concrete treatment of topics than is possible with our present text-books; (5) the comparisons of the simple fundamental type with other examples of contrasts and with topics of opposite character set children to thinking, and give them a chance to see the far-reaching importance of the large and significant ideas in our history. A true interest is awakened by following the growth of important ideas.

Whatever topics are treated in our history should be made thoroughly intelligible and interesting to children, and their bearings on present day problems should be clearly seen.

DISCUSSION

BY HERMAN T. LUKENS

I believe that it is impossible to present the subject of type studies in any other way than by examples concretely. It is only by following out the teaching of a series of lessons which work out a type study fully that its nature can be brought out. I confess that I heard of type studies and thought the idea excellent for years before I began to grasp the essential features of the idea. It was only after repeatedly seeing lesson units worked out in a series of recitations that I have been able to grasp the fuller importance of the type study in laying out a course of study and in planning a series of lessons. I shall therefore make concrete what I have to say.

There are two parts to every full treatment of a type: (1) the presentation of the type, and (2) the comparisons that expand the type idea. I shall illustrate both of these.

In the first, the essential point is to provide clear, definite images. Nothing essential should be left uncertain or general. The presentation should be so vivid and realistic as to seem as if one had lived through the experience. I shall take as an illustration a visit to Mount Vernon a hundred years ago. Have before the class the largest scale maps available of the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay to show the physical features and the definite location of the plantation, the estuary of the Potomac, and the characteristics of drowned valleys as shown in Chesapeake Bay and its branches. Draw as large as practicable a map of the plantation, showing the location of every detailed feature. As our purpose is to give clear mental images this map should be filled out with

detail from whatever source is available, and where the facts fail us, the map must show definitely the way things may have been. For here our purpose is the same as that of the skillful novelist, namely, to provide a living picture of life. Pictures of Mount Vernon as it is now are very useful and are readily available. An article by Kozlowski in the *Century Magazine* for February, 1902, gives picturesque facts.

After having gone seven miles south from Alexandria through a country broken by hill and vale and thickly covered with forest, we arrived at the foot of a hill where General Washington's possessions begin. The road has been newly hewn through an oak forest and leads shortly to another hill, on whose top is situated the spacious white mansion, crowned with a little cupola, with attics and blinds painted in green. In front is a beautiful lawn sloping to the steep bluff, one hundred and twenty-five feet above the Potomac River. Washington was at his farm. Mrs. Washington received us most graciously and hastened to serve punch.

At two o'clock the General arrived on the back of a gray horse. He dismounted, shook hands, and gave a lash to his horse, which went alone to the stable. After a short conversation, he retired to change his clothes. We then inspected the interior of the house. The entrance hall leads through to the piazza on the south front. Adjoining is the parlor with a picture of General Washington at the time when he was in the English service. Mrs. Washington's picture hangs opposite. There were also pictures of young Lafayette, young Custis, and one of the lovely Miss Custis, with her hair blown about by a storm. From the parlor we pass into a large room recently added by the General and the most beautiful in the house. The fireplace is of white marble and is adorned with beautiful bas-reliefs. Pictures after Trumbull represent the death of Warren at Bunker Hill and

the death of Montgomery at Quebec. The next is the music room, adorned with sea scenes and containing the excellent harpsichord of Miss Custis. On the west of the hall are the library, dining room, and the General's bedroom. The upper story contains the rooms of Mrs. Washington and Miss Custis, and also the guest chambers.

On the south front is the large open gallery supported by eight pillars two stories high. The most beautiful view is to be had from here. The rolling Potomac is visible for four or five miles, and the boats going to and fro give movement to the scene. The dense thicket on the bluff is full of many kinds of birds. Deer formerly were to be seen frequently on the place, but now seldom show themselves. This gallery is the place where the General and his family spend their afternoons with their guests, enjoying the fresh air and the beautiful scenery.

About three o'clock a carriage drawn by two horses, accompanied by a young man on horseback, stopped before the door. A young lady of wonderful beauty and sweetness, attended by an elderly companion, descended. It was Miss Nellie Custis, Mrs. Washington's granddaughter.

After dinner we adjourned again to the gallery to read the newspapers. The General takes as many as ten different ones. In the evening he showed us around his garden. It is well cultivated, perfectly kept, and quite in the English style. All the vegetables for the kitchen are raised here. Different kinds of berries — currants, raspberries, strawberries, and gooseberries — are abundant; also a great many peaches and cherries, but these are destroyed by blackbirds and negroes before they are ripe. The sweet scent of the violets was the pleasantest I have ever noticed. The beautiful trees include the tulip, the magnolia, the catalpa, and some beautiful dark green spruce. Many weeping willows adorn the lawn back of the mansion on the northwest.

At sunset we saw the General's herd of cattle coming home. The superb bull had cost him two hundred dollars. We went then to see the donkeys. Lafayette has sent him two stallions — one from Malta, and another from Spain. There are some fifty mules on the estate.

The next day was Sunday. Washington kept to his room to attend to his correspondence, this day being sacred to this occupation. Young Mr. Custis showed me a hillock covered with old chestnuts, oaks, weeping willows, cedars, and other trees. It is the burial ground of the plantation, where the inhabitants of Mount Vernon sleep quietly, after having closed their eyes forever. A few weeks before this the teacher of the little granddaughters had died and was laid to rest in the evening of a quiet autumn day. The sun was just setting behind the blue hills and the thick woods, its rays falling obliquely on the broad Potomac. The venerable preacher, with silvery white hair, read a prayer for the dead, while around stood the assembled family, with bowed heads, weeping.

In the afternoon there were two guests. In the evening we retired at nine o'clock.

The next morning we rode out on horseback to see the General's farms. Mount Vernon contains about eight thousand acres, and stretches for ten miles along the Potomac. He owns other extensive tracts on the Kanawha and on the Shenandoah. All together he is worth about half a million dollars. We saw this morning vast plains covered with different kinds of grain: rye, Indian corn, and wheat. A large meadow was sown with lucerne, another with peas. The whole plantation is divided into five farms, each under an overseer, and all under the general oversight of Mr. Anderson, the chief steward, a Scotch farmer.

The portion in the elbow of the Potomac and between that stream and Little Hunting Creek is named The River Farm and contains 2,000 acres. Beyond Little Hunt-

ing Creek are Mansion House Farm of 1,200 acres, Union Farm of 1,000 acres, Dogue Run Farm of 2,000 acres, and Muddy Hole Farm of 1,300 acres. Washington has about 580 acres in grass, 400 acres in oats, 700 acres in wheat, 750 acres in corn, 200 acres in barley, buckwheat, potatoes, peas, beans, and turnips.

We saw a very large stone grist mill, containing Oliver Evans's improved process water power machinery. Besides grinding flour for the family and the others living on the plantation, this mill grinds about a thousand barrels yearly to sell, bringing five dollars a barrel. The charge for grinding grain for others is one-eighth of the product. The old mill is one of the most picturesque spots on the plantation. The miller lives near by and has a dozen negroes employed about the mill. The heavy rains of last spring caused considerable damage at the mill, carrying away a part of the overshot wheel. Repairs were made entirely by the carpenters and stonemasons of the plantation, except that some steel parts of the machinery were brought from England. The mill is two miles from the Great House.

Next to the mill is a distillery, which is under the charge of Mr. Anderson's son. Twelve thousand gallons of whiskey are made here annually. This produces an income of at least \$10,000 a year. The refuse from the distillery is fed to the pigs, of which some hundred or more are kept.

Here and there about the plantation we saw herds of sheep. There are from six hundred to seven hundred of them, somewhat smaller than the English sheep. There are one hundred twelve cows, two hundred twenty-five work oxen and steers.

The slaves live in cabins in small groups in various parts of the plantation. They are not all together in a slave quarter. We entered some of the huts. The husband and wife sleep on a miserable bed, the children on

the floor. Each shack had a very poor chimney, a few articles of kitchen furniture, a rough board table, a few stools, and some teacups and pans and kettles. As we entered the cabin a boy was lying on the floor in an attack of convulsions. The General had sent to Alexandria for a physician. He treats his negroes far more humanely than the greater part of his Virginia countrymen, who generally give to the negroes nothing but bread and water and lashes. Even here the negroes are not infrequently lashed by the overseers. But the natural gaiety of their spirits brings the song to their lips and the smile to their faces even in the midst of oppression and toil.

The plantation has three hundred negroes, besides women and children, a part of whom belong to Mrs. Washington. A small orchard with vegetable garden was situated close to these huts. There were five or six hens, each with ten or fifteen chickens following her. That is the only pleasure allowed to the negroes: they are not permitted to keep ducks, geese, or pigs. They sell the chickens in Alexandria, and with the money they buy a little furniture. They receive a peck of Indian corn every week and twenty herring a month. At harvest time those working in the field receive salt meat. Each man receives a cotton jacket and a pair of breeches yearly. Only about a third of them are engaged in the field. The rest are in personal service, or are working as house servants, gardeners, weavers, carpenters, coopers, blacksmiths, tanners, shoemakers, millers, distillers, butchers, rope makers, masons, or bricklayers. The woods furnish the timber for the carpenters and coopers, who make the hogsheads for the tobacco and the casks for the cider and whiskey, who build and keep in repair all the dwellings, barns, stables, plows, harrows, gates, fences, out-houses, such as the smoke house, the laundry, the school house, the wagon house, the spring house, the slaughter house, the carpenter shop, etc.

The tanners tan and dress the skins into leather for the whole population and the shoemakers make the shoes for the negroes. An itinerant shoemaker comes around once a year and is hired for three or four months at a time to make and mend shoes for the white part of the family. The blacksmiths make and repair the plows, harrows, chains, bolts, hinges, horseshoes, etc. The spinners, weavers, and knitters make all the coarse cloth and stockings worn by the negroes, the children, and even some of finer texture worn by the white folks. The rope makers make rope from the hemp raised on the plantation. The distillers make whiskey, and peach, apple, and persimmon brandy.

The next morning the General rode with us in order to show us another of his farms. We passed by large fields of hemp and flax. He is interested in agriculture more than in anything else and is ready to talk of it by the hour. He showed us a plow of his invention, which plants corn in the furrow that it plows. He has planned and built a remarkable octagonal barn, with threshing floor above, and has invented a machine for threshing grain. He is constantly trying experiments with crops and inventing new ways of doing things. His five farms are experiment stations which he keeps in competition with one another.

He pursues a quiet and rather uniform life. He rises at five in the morning and reads or writes till seven. For breakfast he takes a cup of tea with a cake of corn meal covered with butter and honey. He then goes on horseback to see the work in the fields or in the shops. He often stops in the middle of a meadow to hold a consultation with Mr. Anderson. He returns at two, changes his dress, and is ready for dinner. If there are guests, and there usually are, he likes to sit with them on the south porch and talk, with a glass of old Madeira by his side. Then he will glance through the newspapers rapid-

ly and answer letters. Tea is served at seven; he talks until nine, then he goes to bed.

One morning while at Mount Vernon I went on a long walk with Mr. Anderson and some negroes to the herring fishery. Immense numbers are taken in April. Crabs are also caught in great quantities and are a favorite dish of the negroes.

One day in the afternoon we discovered some deer browsing in the grass a short distance from the house. The General proposed to me to go and see them at closer range. We went. He walks very quickly, and I could scarcely keep up with him. We made a turn in order to drive the roebucks toward the field. However, it did not succeed, for they disappeared in the woods.

In the evening we went down with Washington to the warehouse and store at the landing, in order to see the goods coming from Europe. He has a correspondent in London from whom he orders goods and to whom is consigned every shipment from the estate. Here were dry goods, millinery, hardware, tools, drugs, chinaware, jewelry, glassware, furniture, shoes, hats, papers, books, and many other articles that could not be produced by the crude industries of the plantation. Here also were hogsheads of tobacco, sacks of wheat, barrels of flour, and casks of whiskey, ready for the ships to take them to England.

The above account of Mount Vernon is a sample of the detailed concrete presentation of the type. It is by no means all the material, but it shows the character of definiteness, vividness, clearness, and actual happening. I now turn to the second part of the lesson treatment, namely, the expansion of the type by comparisons.

A type study is a large, vital, expansive idea connecting in an organic way a large amount of material. Consider, for example, the plantation system of Virginia, explaining, as Dr. McMurtry has just pointed out, the social,

economic, and political organization of the South, the dependence on slavery, the contrast with the North, the absence of towns, the dearth of manufacturing, and the training of the great landowner type of statesman, such as our early presidents were.

These connections are dynamic. There is thought movement through cause and effect, from past to present. This is all that makes the past interesting. Thus history is not left at the narrative stage, with an appeal to the memory chiefly, and a failure to see any connection with the present. The type study, properly chosen, is a vital idea of the present, requiring the history of its development from the past to be taught in order that the present shall be understood. There is need of as full concrete detail for the proper imagery of the type as in any other present day teaching. But the study is a type, and hence immediately expands by comparisons to cover a larger field than its concrete illustration. Thus, the Virginia plantation, compared with Mount Vernon, Arlington, Monticello, Shirley, Brandon, Westover, etc., is traced through its modifications in the feudal manors of Maryland, the patroon estates on the Hudson, the rice plantations of South Carolina, the cotton plantations of Georgia, the sugar estates of Louisiana. The influence of the invention of Whitney's cotton gin is seen, the understanding and appreciation of the Southern aristocracy, and in large part of the whole negro question, is made possible.

I do not know of anything more interesting to young or old than these comparisons that illumine history and make it possible to understand one age or event by its likeness to another. History does repeat itself in never ending variations. My failure in my school days to understand the American Revolution was due to my failure to compare it with any other revolution. I never thought of it as having any features like those of the French Revolution, or the English Revolution, or the Swiss Re-

volt from Austria, or the Greek from Turkey, or the Dutch from Spain. When I began to compare Washington's campaigns with Napoleon's, both were more intelligible and interesting.

In school I failed to understand the English Colonies, because Canada was never compared with the other thirteen. The reasons for its loyalty never entered our minds, even though we knew the story of Evangeline. It was long afterward that I was surprised to find that the Spanish and Portuguese colonies had had their wars for independence also. I wanted to follow up their history and see if they had a Washington and why they did not form a United States also. We had no comparisons to help us in studying Columbus. His work was utterly inexplicable. It was simply narrative. We learned the facts clearly enough, but the trade routes, the Northwest Passage, Magellan's voyage around the world, polar exploration, and the Panama Canal were topics that were kept in separate water-tight compartments. To have gone from one to another of these would have subjected us to a charge of mind-wandering. We studied the founding of the thirteen English Colonies but never dreamed that Great Britain ever founded any elsewhere or that when she lost the thirteen she gained twice as great a territory on the opposite side of the globe. That France struggled with England for territory in North America we learned, but never thought of the struggle for India, or the partition of Africa.

So the great contrast and conflict of our North and South starts with the settlement of Massachusetts by the Puritan democracy and of Virginia by the Cavalier aristocracy. With the former went town meeting, freedom, manufactures, and cities; with the latter went the plantation life, slavery, no manufacturing, and the absence of towns. These dominant ideas marshal the great masses of detailed facts in their proper places of subordi-

nation. They bring order and understanding into the whole field.

The appropriate types, then, are the great ideas that have interpretative power. To make a course of study is to be able to choose these great ideas. There are not so many at all if we keep to the vital ones. Most of our present history material has its place in the comparisons that make so important and little understood a part of type study teaching.

Just as truly as we must give abundant time to the complete concrete treatment of the type, so when that is done and the proper mental imagery is provided, then begins the very rapid and suggestive treatment of the wide field of the type by comparison. Thus, but few great topics would be taught, but these would be such as would organize the whole subject.

One great advantage of this treatment is that the pupils are early given the interpretative ideas by which to understand the present, but the type idea sets them endless variations, applications, and problems to follow up. Instead of exhausting a subject the type treatment opens up the subject for further study. I know of nothing more stimulating to effort and suggestive of thought than the rapid survey afforded by well chosen comparisons. These comparisons enable us to understand the present through the past. It is only by seeing the similarities and differences that we can apply our knowledge of the past to the solution of our own problems. Thus only do we, indeed, see that the present has anything to do with the past. Thus only does experience teach us.

In very truth, thinking is nothing else than these comparisons. History teaching is too often a chronicle of events with but little of the movement of thought that comes from the association of ideas by comparison. The type study aims at this dynamic movement of thought as its main stage and purpose.

DE SOTO'S LINE OF MARCH FROM THE VIEW- POINT OF AN ETHNOLOGIST

BY JOHN R. SWANTON

The reconstruction of De Soto's line of march has always been a fascinating quest to the historian of our Southern States; and it is of quite as much interest to the ethnologist, since the De Soto journals furnish our earliest extensive information regarding the location and early condition of the Indian tribes of the region traversed.

Those who have hitherto attempted this reconstruction have depended principally upon old maps, the identification of geographical features such as rivers and mountains, records of distances, and a consideration of the ground which could probably be covered by a force similarly equipped and accompanied by a drove of hogs. The ethnologist must, of course, consider all these things, but his first interest is in the identification of the tribes and towns encountered and the determination of the languages from which the names recorded are drawn. Such data do not yield final results by themselves, because tribes and linguistic stocks may change their geographical positions; but they have this advantage that every name is different, whereas it is often impossible to distinguish one river or one chain of mountains from another by the mere description. If, of two or more possible locations, one is confirmed by the known later position of a tribe referred to, that location certainly ought to be accepted in preference to any other.

The ethnologist approaches this subject in two ways: (1) as a historian does, by collecting all the documentary information possible regarding a tribe or place mention-

ed; and (2) by an analysis of the name itself in order to discover at least the language to which it belongs, in order to refer this information to a known linguistic area. He is assisted somewhat by other items of ethnological information also, by references to the customs, types of houses, dress, and other characteristics, but all this is of comparatively slight consequence. I may say here that the most valuable of the four De Soto narratives is that of Rangel incorporated in Oviedo's work, second to which is the Elvas chronicle. The Biedma account is important but much condensed. Garcilasso's pretentious work is of the least value from the point of view of names, dates, and the sequence of events. The numbers of Spaniards and Indians are also grossly exaggerated. At the same time I think it will be found that it embodies ethnological material of considerable value not elsewhere recorded. It bears the same relation to the other three documents that Pénicaut's *Louisiana* bears to the narratives of La Harpe and Iberville.

The items to which I propose to call your attention in this paper have been ferreted out by one or both of the means above referred to, but the section to which I have been able to devote particular attention is that part of De Soto's course between Ocilla River, Florida, and "Mabila". As yet it is impossible to approach the question with anything like a complete equipment, owing to the fragmentary state of our information regarding the Indian languages in the area under discussion. These languages are the following:

1. Timucua, now extinct as a spoken tongue, but partially preserved in the grammar, catechism, etc., of Father Pareja, a missionary among the Timucua tribes in the seventeenth century.
2. The Muskogean dialects, including:
 - a. Muskogee proper or Creek, still spoken by numbers of Indians and partially recorded.

b. Hitchiti, used by a small and decreasing number of Indians among the Creeks and Seminoles. There is a large manuscript vocabulary of this language but much still remains to be collected. Mikasuki is practically identical with Hitchiti and Apalachee and Yamasi probably differed little, though not much is left of either of these.

c. Alabama and Koasati, which resemble each other closely and are still spoken by from three to four hundred people. The writer probably has the largest vocabulary of Alabama in existence, but it can be greatly extended.

d. Choctaw and Chickasaw, which are almost identical, and are spoken by several thousand Indians. The published and unpublished material in them is extensive, but they have not been investigated by a trained philologist. The languages of the old Mobile Indians and of a number of other small tribes were nearly the same.

e. Natchez, spoken at the present time by only four persons. There is a considerable vocabulary but only a beginning has been made in studying this.

3. The Siouan dialects including:

a. The Siouan dialects of the southeast, now represented by Catawba only, though material exists also in Tutelo, Woccon, and Saponi. Little study of these has been made.

b. One western Siouan dialect, Quapaw.

4. Cherokee, which belongs to the Iroquoian group of languages. It is still spoken by several thousand people, but a complete study of the languages is yet to be made.

5. Tunica, represented by not over half a dozen speakers and studied very slightly.

6. The Caddoan dialects, only three or four of which are preserved. No vocabulary in any way complete exists.

This constitutes a rather formidable array of lan-

guages to master in the process of interpreting the journey of a single explorer.

The first on the list, Timucua, applies to that part of the Florida Peninsula south of Ocilla River. North of that stream, from the Apalachee province to Cofitachiqui and Talimeco we find Apalachee, Hitchiti, Yamasi, and Muskogee, but where one of these related dialects ends and the next begins it is often difficult to say. In fact Hitchiti, Apalachee, and Yamasi were probably too near to one another for an investigator to be able to distinguish the names belonging to each. The names "Chisi", "Ichisi", and "Achese" are evidently the same as Ochese, a term applied by Hitchiti people to the Muskogee. From Cofaqui to Talimeco the names appear to be in Muskogee, but Talimeco itself I shall presently show reason for believing to have been a Yamasi town. Chalaque and Xalaque are presumably two forms of the word Cherokee, and Guasili is perhaps a Cherokee name, but Guaquili and Xuala are from Catawba or a related tongue. From Canasoga on we again have Muskogean dialects, Hitchiti, Muskogee, Alabama, and Choctaw, until we come to Quizquiz close to the Mississippi River, and in many cases we can tell with which dialect we are dealing. But now we find ourselves in a strange land. West of the great River, until well along on Moscoso's western expedition, the names are nearly all enigmas to us. It is commonly supposed that Pacaha — or Capaha as Garcilasso has it — refers to the Quapaw Indians of Siouan stock, but it is unfortunate that this identification rests on the spelling of the poorest of all our authorities, while the other three unanimously give it Pacaha. Coligua may perhaps be Koroa and Tanico may be Tunica, but we can go no farther. It is my belief that most of the names in this trans-Mississippi region are in Natchez and Tunica, but so far I have been able to make little out of them, largely because our knowledge of the languages in question is so slight.

Finally, at Naguatex, in which we may recognize *Nawidish*, "Place of salt", the language changes again, and, until the river Daycao is reached, nearly all of the proper names are plainly recognized as Caddoan.

So much for the general problem, and now I will give a few identifications as a result of the work already done. I do not claim that these embody the last word on the subject in any case, but I wish them to be on record for the benefit of future investigators.

1. The first name which I propose to discuss is that of the town or province called by Ranjel "Uçachile", by Elvas "Uzachil", by Biedma "Veachile", and by Garcilasso, who seems to have it out of its proper position, "Ossachile". Biedma's spelling is evidently at fault and may be ignored. On the basis of the other three, I feel sure that this town was the lower Creek town Osotci (or Osochi). The final -l or -le in the Spanish forms is probably the plural (or rather collective) ending, which in Muskogee would be -ülgi (Osotcülgi), but in Hitchiti -üli (Osotcüli), l being a peculiar aspirated l not found in either English or Spanish. I have good independent evidence that the ancient Osotci language was close to Hitchiti. The only valid argument against this identification is the fact that "Uçachile" was south of Ocilla River. Nevertheless, since it was the last place encountered before that river was reached, this objection is not insurmountable. Of course this particular identification does not help us to establish the route of De Soto; it merely adds some information regarding the ancient history of Osotci town.

2. Altamaha, or Altapaha, at once recalls the river of that name, but before it was so localized this term was applied to the largest town among the "lower" or southern Yamasi, as well as to its chief. Now the Yamasi were a coast people; therefore the mention of Altamaha shows

that De Soto was not many leagues from the coast when his chroniclers had occasion to refer to it.

3. Ocute, or Ocuti, two days' march from Altamaha, has usually been identified with Oconee, a Hitchiti town and tribe. But on the important De Crenay map, recently discovered and made available through the efforts of Mr. Peter Hamilton, we find a lower Creek town called Aëquite, which is probably De Soto's Ocute. It must, then, have been a lower Creek, probably Hitchiti, town which disappeared some time during the eighteenth century, and need have had nothing to do with either the Oconee town or Oconee River.

4. Hitherto it does not seem to have been noted that the town called Hymahi by Ranjel, and Aymay by the gentleman of Elvas, and called by the Spaniards "Sucor", appears as Aymi in the list of provinces given by that Indian carried off by Ayllon. The transcriptions from Oviedo and the "Letters Patent" published by Harrisse have been so badly mangled in this place that Aymi can not be recognized, but it may be seen in the copy contained in the *Documentos Ineditos*. Let me add here that the accusation which Oviedo makes that this list was fabricated by the aforesaid Indian, an accusation which Harrisse endorses, is refuted by this identification and by the identification of at least four other names of "provinces" contained in it.

5. Ilapi, mentioned as a small place near Cofitachiqui I identify as the later upper Creek town called Hilibi, spelled on the De Crenay map Ilapé. This is, it is true, a long distance from the historic location of Hilibi town but we know that many other Creek towns — such as Atasi, Kolomi, and Tukabatei — were much farther east in early days.

6. I now come to a discussion of that famous town, the name of which is spelled "Cofitachequi" by Ranjel, "Cutifachiqui" by Elvas, "Cofitachiqui" by Biedma, and

"Cofaciqui" by Garcilasso. The standard historical location assigned to it is Silver Bluff on the Savannah River below Augusta. This would place it in the very center of the territory of the Yuchi Indians, an important tribe with a language absolutely distinct from all others but which I have not included in my list because, as I shall show, I believe that De Soto missed them entirely, and that, with one possible exception, no Yuchi names or words occur in his chronicle. That Cofitachiqui was not a Yuchi town is indicated in the first place by its name, which Dr. Speck, our best student of the Yuchi language, declares is not Yuchi. More conclusive evidence is, however, not wanting. In another place I intend to show that the "Westo Indians" of early South Carolina chroniclers and the Yuchi were almost certainly one and the same people.¹ Now Henry Woodward, interpreter to the early Carolina settlers, refers several times to the Cofitachiqui, and states that they were at war with the Westo whom they had defeated many times. In one or two places the name of the tribe is spelled "Kussitoes", and from this fact and the other items of information which have come down to us I believe the editor of the *Shaftesbury Papers*, as published by the Historical Commission of South Carolina, is correct in identifying them with the Indians of Kasita town, one of the two principal towns among the lower Creeks. That an old fashioned *s* has been consistently misprinted *f* may well be doubted, but between some Indian dialects there is a phonetic change from *s* to *f* and vice versa. The terminal "-chiqui", however, still requires explanation.

In Woodward's day these Cofitachiqui were northwest of the Yuchi, but I will present reasons for believing that, in De Soto's time, they were nearer the coast, in fact not far from the mouth of the Savannah River. We have

¹ See *Handbook of American Indians*, Bulletin 30, Bureau of American Ethnology, Part II, article on Westo.

Westo?

already noted that the mention of Altamaha indicates proximity to the ocean, and the same may be said of Aymay, which was not too far inland at least to be known to Ayllon's Chicora Indian. Again Pardo states that Cofitachiqui was twenty leagues from the sea, and it is likely that this is an over-estimate rather than an under-estimate. The same authority gives "Canos, which the Indians call Canosi", as the proper name for the town, and by this we are reminded of Cannouchee River of eastern Georgia. Nor must we lose sight of the fact that glass beads and Biscayan axes of iron were found in some tombs at Cofitachiqui from which the explorers concluded, probably correctly, "that they were in the government or territory where the lawyer Lucas Vazquez de Ayllon came to his ruin." I lay less stress upon these facts, however, than on circumstantial evidence regarding the neighboring town of Talimeco, which Garcilasso calls Talomeco. This name appears to be from Creek *talwa*, "town" or "tribe", and *miko*, "chief", the whole probably signifying "leading or royal town", and is that which the "cacica of Cofitachiqui" referred to as "my village". There is reason to believe that this town was occupied by Indians of the Chiaha tribe, a fact which will be of present importance, so I will go over my grounds for that belief. A part at least of the Chiaha were living far to the northwest where De Soto subsequently found them. At a later date Pardo also made them a visit and he speaks of them as "Solameco or Chiaha". If the capital S of Solameco is a T misprinted, a not uncommon happening, that town had one name in common with the Talimeco near Cofitachiqui. Now at one time there *were* Chiaha among the Yamasi, for an early Indian agent of South Carolina, writing from the lower Creeks, asks whether it would not be advisable to induce the Chiaha Indians to return to the Yamasi from whom they had lately come. We know also from Bartram that the Chiaha language in his time was

distinct from Muskogee or Creek, and on the other hand we still find a Chiaha River in South Carolina. Besides discovering that there were formerly Chiaha among the Yamasi, we also learn that there was a Yamasi settlement called Tolemato or Tolemaro. While this name does not agree exactly in form with Talimeco, the only considerable difference is in the last consonant, which the alternative reading given shows to be obscure in the original. The account of this place given in Barcia's *Ensayo* indicates that it was at the northern end of the Yamasi territory, and thus not far from the mouth of the Savannah River. Summing up, then, we find that there were two bodies of Chiaha Indians, one in northern Alabama or Georgia or in Tennessee, the other among the Yamasi. We also find that there was a town or tribe among the Yamasi called by a name similar to "Talimeco" and that a name similar to "Talimeco" is given as a synonym for the northern Chiaha. We find, too, that these particular Chiaha and De Soto's Talimeco were both in the northern part of the Yamasi territory. So many coincidences lead me to believe that Talimeco, and therefore Cofitachiqui, when De Soto reached them were on or near the lower Savannah, below Ebenezer Creek. I mention Ebenezer Creek because that stream formed the southern boundary of the Yuchi tribe and De Soto seems to have missed their towns by crossing the Savannah below the mouth of this Creek and marching up into the Cherokee Mountains to the eastward of them.

7. My next point concerns the course of the expedition from the Cherokee country to Coça. It is currently believed that De Soto turned west from Xuala (Saraw), passed near Rome, Georgia, and down the Coosa River; but another suggested route is across the mountains to Tennessee River, down that stream into what is now northern Alabama, and thence overland to the Coosa. Now ethnological evidence favors this latter route. De

? But you
suggested
La 1684

Soto, it will be remembered, encountered several tribes along the stream or streams which he followed, the Chiaha, Coste, Tali, and Tasqui. In early colonial times, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, there were in fact tribes living on the islands in the Tennessee River, much as described, but we have no notice of any upon the Coosa above Coosa town other than some small out-settlements. Four Tennessee River tribes are mentioned, as follows: the Tahogale (a band of Yuchi), the Taskigi, the Koasati, and the "Tali". The first is not referred to by the Spaniards, but the Tasqui are probably the Taskigi, and the Tali appear with the very same spelling. Now, if De Soto passed down Coosa River, these Tali at least must have moved over from the Coosa to the Tennessee between his time and the end of the seventeenth century, and where possible it is best to avoid moving tribes about to suit a particular hypothesis. The Coste or Costehe are perhaps the Koasati, though the resemblance in names is not as close as we ought to find.

8. Another suggestion I wish to make concerns the identity of the Ulibahali (Ranjel) or Ullibahali (Elvas). While these names might plausibly be interpreted in the Alabama language, I believe they are that of the well-known Creek town *hiwahali*, the ancient full form of which is *Holiwahali* or *Huliwahali*. The simple aspirate *h* is often dropped from Indian names by the recorder, while we have plenty of examples of the use in Spanish of *b* or *v* in place of *w*, which is wanting as a native sound in that language.

9. Finally, I can not refrain from calling attention to the fact, first noted, I believe, by Mr. H. S. Halbert of the Alabama State Department of Archives and History, that the Apafalaya of Ranjel and the Pafallaya of Elvas seem to be explained by Adair's statement to the effect that the Choctaw Indians were anciently known to their neighbors as Pansfalaya, "long hairs", because, unlike

other Indians, the men allowed the hair of their heads to grow long all over.

These suggestions will, I hope, be of use to other students of the subject, and I believe many more discoveries await further investigations along this line. We see here one use for a complete record of the Indian languages of America, even of those that are on the point of extinction and may be said to have no future in store for them.

THE DISINTEGRATION AND ORGANIZATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN IOWA, 1852-1860¹

BY LOUIS PELZER

Ante-bellum politics in Iowa entered the decade ending in 1860 with a considerable mass of history and traditions; there are stages of disintegration and decline, metamorphosis and reorganization, growth and triumph. Slavery, the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, Lecomptonism, State questions, and secession are the principal issues on which platforms are constructed, candidates nominated, campaigns waged, and on which political organizations rise and fall.

But little vigor developed in the presidential campaign of 1852. Tariff discussions met with but little response by way of interest and attention and the campaign degenerated into a personal detraction of the candidates. The unreserved indorsement of the compromise measures by the Democrats resulted in the overwhelming defeat of General Scott who carried but four States. In Iowa four Democratic electors were chosen over the Whig candidates by majorities of nearly 2,000. The average number of votes for the Free Soil candidates was 1608.² For the next year Whig fortunes continued to decline. The party held no conventions and its inactivity presaged its early extinction.

Morally and politically the State of Iowa was greatly

¹ Extensive use has been made in the writing of this paper of the following articles by the writer: *The Origin and Organization of the Republican Party in Iowa*, *The History and Principles of the Democratic Party of Iowa, 1846-1857*, and *The History of Political Parties in Iowa from 1857 to 1860*, published in *The Iowa Journal of History and Politics* respectively in the numbers for October, 1906, April, 1908, and April, 1909.

² These figures are based upon the election returns found in the Archives at Des Moines, Iowa.

affected by the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. Bordered on the south by a strongly pro-slavery State and by Nebraska on the west, large numbers of Iowa citizens and their property became endangered in the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska; bitter feeling in Iowa resulted, and the issue between Democrats and Whigs grew more and more acute. Since Governor John Chambers had left office in 1845 the Democrats had had an unbroken lease of power, but prophets of defeat were growing bolder.

For some years the Whig Party had been in a state of slow decomposition. Large numbers had helped to swell the ranks of the Free Soilers; the Silver Grays, Seward Whigs, Hunkers, and Barnburners could claim relation to it; not a few members of the American Party had been recruited from it. If their discordant members had a common denominator of creed it was the opposition to the further extension of slavery.³

These various groups, meeting in the last Whig State Convention at Iowa City on February 22, 1854, placed in nomination for Governor James Wilson Grimes and adopted a plank severely condemning the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. Mr. Grimes's aggressive campaign now became one of the forces which were to weld together the various elements opposed to the further extension of slavery.

Driving from county to county this "Father of Republicanism in Iowa" visited nearly every section of the State from Council Bluffs to Burlington. His speeches molded and gave expression to the anti-slavery sentiment of that time. He reviews in detail the history of the Missouri Compromise and the reasons for its violation, and declares emphatically that "I will *war and war continually* against the abandonment to slavery of a single foot of soil now consecrated to freedom."⁴

³ On March 28, 1854, the Free Soil Convention in Iowa was held at Denmark and adopted resolutions recommending that its members cast their votes for James W. Grimes. — Salter's *Life of James W. Grimes*, pp. 33, 115.

⁴ Salter's *Life of James W. Grimes*, pp. 34-50.

In the election of August 3, 1854, Mr. Grimes received a majority of 2123 votes over Curtis Bates, his Democratic opponent.⁵ This election is one of the most far reaching and significant in the history of Iowa politics. It signalized the death of the old Whig Party and the conception of the new Republican Party.⁶ It ushered out of power a party which had held practical sway for a quarter of a century. It sounded the clarion of opposition to the aggressions of an institution to which the State of Iowa had given aid and comfort by silence, sympathy, and speech.

The Republican Party as an institution now existed; it needed only the machinery of organization. And it was left to Governor Grimes to sound the doctrine which was to weld the opponents of slavery extension into the organized Republican Party of Iowa.⁷

Early in 1855 the anti-slavery elements were already gravitating toward a Republican organization. The silence of the Democratic platform upon the Kansas-Nebraska Act gave heat and cohesion to the growth of Republicanism in 1854 and 1855. The opposition of the American Party to the Democratic Party was causing it

⁵ *Iowa Official Register*, 1905, p. 558.

⁶ "It [slavery] is a local institution, and to the States that maintain it, belong its responsibilities and its perils. . . . It is both the interest and the duty of the free States to prevent the increase and the extension of the slave power, by every constitutional means. . . . Congress can pass no law establishing or protecting it in the territories. If Congress can pass no such law, much less can it delegate such authority to the territorial legislatures, over whose acts it has ever exercised supervisory and restraining power."—From the inaugural address of December 9, 1854, by Governor Grimes, as printed in Shambaugh's *Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of Iowa*, Vol. II, p. 13.

⁷ On April 8, 1855, Governor Grimes wrote to Salmon P. Chase of Ohio: "It seems to me that it is time to thoroughly organize the Republican party. The Know-Nothings have pretty well broken down the two old parties, and a new one, now organized, would draw largely from the foreign element that goes to make up those parties, while it will draw away one-half the Know-Nothings at least."—Printed in Salter's *Life of James W. Grimes*, pp. 68, 69.

to seek a coalition with Republicans. "I abhor the principle of the Know-Nothings, so far as I understand them," wrote Governor Grimes in May, 1855, "yet I think they are accomplishing a great work in breaking down the old parties."⁸

Agitation by the anti-slavery press for a State Convention of the anti-slavery groups now began, and early in 1856 these groups were ready to respond to a summons to concerted action. Early in January of that year there appeared in the anti-slavery press a notice entitled "To the Citizens of Iowa". This sounded the dangers from the Democratic Party and invited the anti-slavery forces, "to meet in Convention at Iowa City on the 22d day of February, for the purpose of organizing a Republican party."⁹

Behind this call there was no convention, no chairman, no central committee. But the clear, tactful style and the direct statement show the hand of Governor Grimes. No man in the State at this time possessed such a knowledge of men and affairs and such a grasp upon the public confidence as did he; no one could more genuinely give expression to the voice of the people.

For nearly two years political metamorphosis had been going on, and the various groups were gradually assuming a more stable political equilibrium; each party could now recognize its movements and tendencies as well as those of its opponents; each party was now able to see and to judge its elements of strength and those of decay; and each party was now proclaiming its historic achievements in resolutions, platforms, and in the utterances of men and newspapers competent to give them expression.

⁸ Printed in *Salter's Life of James W. Grimes*, p. 70.

⁹ This call or notice may be found in the following newspapers: *Muscatine Journal*, Vol. I (New Series), No. 1, January 14, 1856; *The Daily Gate City* (Keokuk), Vol. II, No. 263, January 8, 1856; *Des Moines Courier* (Ottumwa), Vol. VII, No. 48, January 17, 1856; *Dubuque Republican*, Vol. I, No. 42, January 15, 1856.

A vast amount of criticism and denunciation was directed by the Democratic press at the Know-Nothing movement toward Republicanism.¹⁰ The Convention of February 22nd would be a desecration by the fusion of various fanatical elements. The Republicans denied all relationship and declared truthfully that Republicanism was a product of Democratic as well as of American elements.¹¹ Governor Grimes had declared in emphatic terms that "Anti Know-Nothingism and anti-Slavery Extension must be the two great planks of the Republican organization."¹²

Conventions and mass meetings throughout the State chose delegates during January and February, 1856. A total of about four hundred delegates assembled in the Hall of Representatives in the Old Capitol at Iowa City.¹³ Philip Viele was chosen as permanent chairman, and enthusiasm and business dispatch marked the proceedings. Long and animated discussions on various issues took place but the Convention finally voted to adopt a plank devoted entirely to anti-slavery extension.¹⁴

Presidential electors and a State ticket were then nominated; delegates to the National Convention were chosen and a State Central Committee of five was named. After giving nine lusty cheers for the success of the new party the Convention on February 23rd adjourned *sine die*.

The Republican Party of Iowa has now completed

¹⁰ Burlington Daily Iowa State Gazette, Vol. I, No. 172, January 17, 1856.

¹¹ Dubuque Republican, Vol. I, No. 57, February 1, 1856.

¹² Quoted in the Dubuque Republican, Vol. I, No. 57, February 1, 1856.

¹³ The minutes of this Convention are found in the following newspapers: Muscatine Journal, Vol. I (New Series), No. 33, February 26, 1856; The Daily Gate City (Keokuk), Vol. II, No. 306, February 27, 1856; Dubuque Express and Herald, February 26, 1856; Dubuque Republican, Vol. I, No. 77, February 26, 1856; and Des Moines Courier, (Ottumwa), Vol. VIII, No. 2, February 28, 1856.

¹⁴ The platform consists of seven planks to which are joined three resolutions.

more than half a century of organized existence. From the Whigs it inherited its policy of broad construction and its liberal views on economic and constitutional doctrines; the Free Soilers gave to it its program of "no more slave States and no more slave Territories"; the Democrats bequeathed to it its popular methods; and much of its aggressive character has been a legacy of the Abolitionists.¹⁵

Although a sharp defeat had met the Democrats in 1856, the elixir of Federal patronage from Buchanan still acted as a cohesive force among a large portion of the Iowa Democracy. Their receding fortunes, however, grew more and more apparent as the year 1857 wore on, and disaster after disaster befell them at the election of October 13th of that year.

Immediately after this election events of profound moral and political significance were taking place in Kansas. There the evil effects of the Kansas-Nebraska Act were seen in discord and disaster. "Kansas is a great country", remarked an Iowa editor. "Thermometer over 100; excitement over 10,000; justice below zero."¹⁶

By the year 1858 the leaven of abolitionism had raised the Republican Party into a dominating agency with a definite mission. Douglas's revolt from the course of the administration was operating as the dividing wedge among the Iowa Democracy. More united than ever sounded Iowa's protests against Buchanan's course in Kansas, while the Lincoln-Douglas debates found responsive chords among the political groups in Iowa.

Henry Clay Dean, a lifelong prophet of the Democracy, issued in February, 1858, a set of lamentations upon the ills of his chosen party. "The negro question," he said, "with which we have legitimately nothing under

¹⁵ Since 1856 the State of Iowa has had, with one exception, an unbroken line of Republican Governors. This exception was Horace Boies, a Democrat, who served as Governor from 1890 to 1894.

¹⁶ *The Fairfield Ledger*, Vol. VII, No. 44, October 29, 1857.

the Heavens to do, has cost us two Governors, two United States Senators, four Congressmen, the whole of the Supreme Bench, and Both Houses of the Legislature, for three successive sessions. . . . We have nothing left us but our party platform and our political integrity."¹⁷

"Popular Sovereignty" and "State Reform" were the watchwords of the campaign of 1858. The utterances of Douglas were arrayed against those of Buchanan by the Republican leaders. In the election of the entire Republican ticket on October 13th the State subscribed powerfully to Republicanism.¹⁸ A decade had changed and fixed the political complexion of the State of Iowa.

When the year 1859 opened, the breach in the Democratic Party was far from being healed, and many Democrats feared that their differences if carried into forthcoming conventions would result in a formal disruption of the organization. The Republican journals, moreover, did not attempt to play the rôle of a peacemaker for the discordant members of the Democracy or for its conflicting tenets.

Desertions from the Democratic ranks were many, and again on October 11, 1859, the entire Republican ticket was elected. The people of Iowa in this year felt more keenly and saw more thoroughly than ever before the evils of Lecomptonism. The political pendulum was swinging farther away from slavery extension and the ante-bellum decade had matured new political creeds and converts.

For the last time ante-bellum issues were to be led into the arena of debate and discussion for the year 1860, and in the discordant Democratic National Convention at Charleston the Republicans saw an omen of success. The seceding delegates at Charleston reassembled at Balti-

¹⁷ Quoted from the *Daily Express and Herald* in *The Dubuque Weekly Times*, Vol. I, No. 34, February 24, 1858.

¹⁸ Election returns may be found in the *Daily Iowa State Gazette*, Vol. IV, No. 134, December 10, 1858.

more on June 28, and had placed John C. Breckinridge and Joseph Lane in nomination for President and Vice President. Since May the Constitutional Union Party had had its candidates, John Bell and Edward Everett, in the field. What did this quadrangular contest augur for the future of the Iowa Democrats?

Davenport seems to have been the instigator of the Breckinridge-Lane movement in Iowa. There as early as June 12, 1860, a coterie of Buchanan dyed Democrats had ratified the nomination of the two candidates.¹⁹ Later in the same month at the same place resolutions were adopted and a committee of three appointed to propel the movement.²⁰

On August 15 this section of the Democracy met in State Convention at Davenport, and the spirit of James Buchanan certainly animated the delegates. Committees were appointed to manage the campaign; four Presidential electors were nominated but no State nominations were made. The platform of seven resolutions is an ultra Buchanan document while the public address issued later presents a long and detailed statement and argument of the pro-slavery wing of the Democratic Party.²¹

Pursuant to preliminary meetings and calls, forty or fifty Union delegates met at Iowa City on August 31, 1860. Here, too, four Presidential electors were nominated and a State Executive Committee of ten was elected to manage the campaign. The five resolutions adopted deplored sectional strife, expressed alarm at the growth of the executive power, and invited the people to look to the records of Bell and Everett who stood upon "the basis of the Constitution, the Union of the States and the enforcement of the laws."²²

¹⁹ *The Iowa State Register*, Vol. V, No. 22, July 11, 1860.

²⁰ *Iowa Weekly Republican*, Vol. XI, No. 606, July 4, 1860.

²¹ The full text of these resolutions is to be found in *The Lyons City Advocate*, Vol. V, No. 32, September 8, 1860.

²² *Muscatine Weekly Journal*, Vol. XII, No. 10, September 7, 1860.

This, the fourth of Iowa's Presidential campaigns, was a memorable one. Never were mass meetings, ratification meetings, rallies, and joint discussions more numerous. And in all these demonstrative features there is discernible a deeper appreciation of the grave and momentous issues of this contest.

Prophecies and forecasts — those volatile elements of all campaigns became more and more numerous as the election of November 6, 1860, drew near. The popular votes for President stood: Lincoln, 70,118; Douglas, 55,639; Breckinridge, 1034; Bell, 1763. In elections for State officers the triumph of the Republicans was equally great.²³

With the election of Abraham Lincoln there ends the ante-bellum period of Iowa's political history. Decades of slavery agitation and compromises evolve into the issues of secession and union; the political historian must write of "arms and the man", and the man is Lincoln rather than Douglas, Kirkwood rather than Dodge. And no longer can the questions of the hour be settled by Chief Justice Taney and the Supreme Court but rather by General Grant at Appomatox Court House.

²³ These statistics are taken from *The Cedar Valley Times*, Vol. X, No. 14, December 20, 1860, and *The Iowa State Register*, Vol. V, No. 44, December 12, 1860.

ATTITUDE OF THE WESTERN WHIGS TOWARD THE CONVENTION SYSTEM

BY CHARLES MANFRED THOMPSON

The present widespread agitation for the displacing of nominating conventions by preferential and mandatory primaries, is but a phase of the more general agitation for a change of government from a pure representative type to one in which the will of the people may be more quickly and effectively expressed. The question of representative government, which is intimately bound up with the Constitution and its development, has been, and is now, receiving with an increased interest the attention of scholars, publicists, and statesmen; but the nominating convention, which is a logical offshoot of the representative form of American government has, until a very recent time, been the subject of minor consideration, particularly as regards the attitude of one or the other of the great parties during the days of its infancy. The conclusions herein drawn relate primarily to conditions in Illinois, but a study of the contemporary press of Ohio and Indiana seems to show that the Whigs in the three States held in general a similar attitude toward the convention system.

National nominating conventions as they are known at the present time, first came into use for the purpose of expressing the will of a political party through chosen representatives, in the presidential campaign of 1832. The first in the field was that of the Anti-Masons. A little later the National Republicans held their convention, and, as had been predicted on all sides, selected Clay as their standard bearer. Last in point of time, but far more important in results than the other two, was the Democratic

Convention, which chose Van Buren for second place on the ticket headed by Jackson.

The great importance of the Democratic Convention arises from the fact that in later years those factions of the Whig Party which opposed conventions in one form or another used as the basis of their arguments against the system, the well founded charge that the Democratic Convention of 1831 was not only packed with office-holders and hence did not represent the people at large but that it used steam roller methods in nominating Van Buren.¹ Particularly in the West, where Johnson had a comparatively strong following, was there considerable dissatisfaction with the Convention's choice for Vice President, and this hostile feeling was accentuated when it was considered that the East had been more than proportionally represented in that body which had so summarily dismissed the claims of the "slayer of Tecumseh". Even the anti-convention Whigs, who recognized a logical relationship between their own party and the old National Republicans, explained away the apparent inconsistency of their position by claiming that the body which had nominated Clay in 1831 was by no means a nominating convention, but rather a meeting at which the opponents of the administration met "to exchange sentiments"; and to support this argument they produced ample evidence from the contemporary anti-Jackson press.² According to the statements of the opponents of the convention system, Clay's selection was incidental and of secondary importance, for he was the only logical candidate of the party at that time. It was claimed, moreover, and with considerable truth, that the National Republican Convention was not, as was that held by the Democrats, composed of delegates, many of whom were under obligation not only to a political party with a num-

¹ *Alton Telegraph*, May 13, 1843.

² *Utica Intelligencer* (New York), August 17, 1830; *Cincinnati American*, December 13, 1830.

ber of offices to be distributed, but what was more significant to a single and powerful individual.³ The last step in the argument against the convention system, and the one that appeared most forceful, was to show the intimate relation between the old Congressional caucus and a convention made up of office-holders. Without stopping to analyze these two institutions in order to discover where the arguments used to connect them are fallacious, it is enough to state that many in both parties believed that they were differing types of the same species — institutions created by office-holders and professional politicians for the purpose of defeating the sovereign will of the people.

The most important immediate result of the opposition to the convention that nominated Van Buren for the vice presidency in 1831, was a considerable accession to the ranks of the anti-administrationists.⁴ In Illinois, where there had been a deep schism in the Democratic ranks over the Van Buren-Johnson contest, many of the latter's friends denounced the methods used to defeat their champion, and soon after allied themselves with the opposition; and after the advent of the Whig Party in 1834, it is this element that kept up the anti-convention fight long after the old line National Republican-Whigs had become reconciled to the convention system. The dictatorial and proscriptive methods of Jackson's managers were no less in evidence in the convention of 1831 than they had been in the administration of the government; and on account of these methods, those members of the Democratic Party who were becoming dissatisfied with the attitude of the administration toward national policies were forced into, or very near, the ranks of the opposition.

Following the general scheme of defeating Van

³ *Alton Telegraph*, May 13, 1843.

⁴ Joseph Duncan was the most striking example in Illinois. See note at the end of this paper.

Buren in 1836, by combining against him the strength of the favorite sons of many widely located sections, no National Whig Convention was held, and as far as the newspapers of Illinois disclose the fact, none was seriously considered. In accordance with precedents of 1824 and 1826, however, various candidates were brought forward by State legislatures, such as McLean in Ohio and White by the Senate in Illinois, while Van Buren received the endorsement of the House.⁵ At the same time the Whigs, in the General Assembly of the latter State went on record against State and county conventions by "resolving, that we believe the establishment of the Convention system in this state, for the purpose of nominating all state and county officers, to be anti-republican, and ought not to be tolerated in a republican government." With two exceptions all the Whigs present voted for the resolution, and with them voted five Democrats from the southern part of the State.⁶

Supporting this resolution were many old line Whigs who cared little about the abstract principles upon which opposition to the convention was based, but who considered that a pretense of believing the institution unrepublican might bring the users of it into disrepute with the voters, or compel them to abandon it entirely, with the result that a dissipation of party strength at the polls would come about through the introduction of independent Democratic candidates, just as had happened in the gubernatorial elections of 1826 and 1834. Closely connected with this attempt to discountenance the convention was the party caucus, which the Whigs used as a means for concentrating voting strength. Under the leadership

⁵ *The Western Hemisphere*, January 2, 1835; *Illinois Senate Journal*, 1835-1836, pp. 76 ff.; *Illinois House Journal*, 1835-1836, pp. 211 ff.

⁶ At about the same time the Democrats in convention endorsed the convention system.—See *Illinois Intelligencer*, October 21, 1835; also *Sangamo Journal*, December 12, 1835; and *Illinois Advocate*, December 17, 1835.

of Lincoln, Webb, Davidson, Edwards, and others, the Whig candidates were usually not allowed to multiply unduly, and in a surprisingly large number of cases slates were successfully made by a small group of Whig politicians, most of whom were members of the General Assembly.⁷

The caucus was quite as unpopular among the people at large as was the convention, but the saving grace of the former institution was the lack of reliable information about it. The Democratic press protested loudly against it, but so long as no positive evidence of its existence could be brought forward, the effect of such denunciations, from an origin so partisan as were the papers of the time, was slight. The Democratic State Convention, which chose candidates for State officers in 1838, amidst the hisses and groans of the Whig press, was stigmatized by the opposition as a "slaughter pen". Yet all the evidence at hand points to the truth of the charge made by the Democrats of the time that the Whig candidate for governor, Cyrus Edwards, was chosen by a midnight caucus made up of prominent Whigs from all over the State, many of whom were office-holders. Thus charges and counter-charges of political bossism were made so repeatedly by the leaders and press of both parties, that it is a great wonder that there was not developed in the minds of the voters a very great repugnance to one or the other system.

Repeated defeats at last convinced the more astute leaders of the Whig Party, that the people did not consider the growth of the convention system as a menace to their liberties. So much so did this feeling come to possess the leaders and press, that by 1839, the desirability

⁷ Both parties used the term "caucus" in a very loose manner. See *Cincinnati Gazette*, March 4, 1830; *Scioto Gazette*, March 24, 1830; *Cincinnati American*, September 13, 1830; and *State Register* (Illinois), September 7, 1837.

of a nominating convention within the State was very generally recognized. In that year many Whig county conventions were held, and the culmination of the movement was the State Whig Convention, the first ever held by that party in the State, which convened at Springfield in October, 1839. At this convention, electors were chosen, committees appointed, and a definite campaign of action outlined.⁸ This meeting marks the passing away of the old haphazard method of trusting to the Whig press to plan the campaign, harmonize measures, and prevent multiplication of candidates, and with the notable exception of 1842, the old plan was never again generally resorted to. Nor was this transition to a new and more definite basis of choosing candidates made without opposition both from within and without the ranks of the party. On the one hand, the Democratic press ridiculed the Whigs for their inconsistency, and justly laid claim to the nominating convention as a Democratic institution; on the other hand, a faction of the party itself, respectable both in number and ability, opposed the innovation.

Without taking the trouble to inquire closely into the real causes for the Whig successes in the Presidential election of 1840, Mr. Lincoln and others gave considerable credit for these successes to the united front of the Whig Party, which had been very generally brought about by a harmonious national nominating convention. Although the Democrats had carried the State for Van Buren, those counties and legislative districts in which the Whigs had faithfully supported the convention nominees showed an increased strength for that party. This close association of nominating conventions and political successes could have but one result: those who had favored the system during the years 1839 and 1840 were strengthened in their conviction, while the more conservative element was

⁸ *Sangamo Journal*, March 16, August 9, September 20, October 4 and 11, 1839.

less sure of its ground. To say the least, the convention had shown its worth from the standpoint of expediency, and with this fact established the opposition within the party retreated behind the stronghold of abstract principles, professing to believe that the success of the party was of less importance than the preservation of liberty in the choice of public officials.

Opposition to the system continued for several years. In 1842, a regular call was made for a State Whig Convention to nominate candidates for governor and lieutenant-governor, and to appoint correspondence and vigilance committees, but there developed such a strong opposition to the plan, that it was thought advisable by the faction favorable to a convention to abandon it for the sake of harmony. Many county and legislative nominating conventions were held, however, but the bright prospect of Whig success had the effect of bringing into the campaign many independent Whig candidates, with the result that the Democrats were uniformly successful in doubtful counties and districts, and made serious inroads into such strong Whig counties as Morgan, Coles, and Vermilion.⁹

Heretofore there had been a studied attempt on the part of the Whig State organization, which was favorable to the convention, to keep down any general discussion on the merits of the system, in the hope that it would finally prevail. But the disorganization of the party in the campaign of 1842, due, it was said, to the absence of a State convention at which campaign plans could have been laid, convinced the friends of the nominating convention that an agitation for its general adoption was necessary before the campaign of 1844. Accordingly, at a Whig meeting held at Springfield early in 1843, a committee was appointed to draw up an address to the voters

⁹ *Alton Telegraph*, March 25, 1843; manuscript election returns in the office of the Secretary of State, Springfield, Illinois.

of the State; and among the issues discussed by this committee was the convention.¹⁰

The committee, which was composed of A. Lincoln, S. T. Logan, and A. T. Bledsoe, set forth what may well be considered the attitude of a majority of the Whig Party in Illinois towards the general system of nominating conventions.

Without wasting time to examine the principles upon which the opposition based its arguments, the address, which bears the mark of Mr. Lincoln's hand, struck at the very heart of the question by pointing out that so long as the Democrats used the system, it was madness for the Whigs not to "defend themselves with it". Thus the keynote of the argument as advanced by the committee was expediency. Mr. Lincoln saw clearly that the old system was productive of disorganization and defeat; and seeing this, he had no scruples in placing what the opposition called the sovereign will of the people in the hands of delegates selected by the people themselves. To support the contention, that in union there is strength, the committee cited such illustrations as Aesop's fable of the bundle of sticks, and the biblical admonition that "a house divided against itself cannot stand."

In discussing previous defeats due to the absence of conventions, the gubernatorial election of 1842 received special attention at the hands of the committee. Ex-Governor Duncan, who had been the Whig candidate for governor in that year, was the leader of the opposition to the convention, in fact he had flatly refused to be the candidate if selected by a convention of any sort. It must be remembered that Duncan was originally a member of the "whole hog" Jackson Party, but he had left that party and joined the Whigs about 1834, because of his opposition to the Democratic Convention of 1831 and to the

¹⁰ For report of committee, see *Alton Telegraph*, March 25, 1843. Nicolay and Hay's *Lincoln*, Vol. I, p. 218, mentions the address.

general attitude of the Jackson administration toward the United States Bank. It was around Duncan as a leader that the various elements hostile to conventions had grouped themselves. As soon as the address became public, Duncan took exception to it, particularly to that part which intimated that the Whig defeat of 1842 was due very largely to his antagonism to the convention system.

Very soon after the publication of the address, Duncan was given an opportunity to register publicly his protest against what he considered an accusation. At a meeting of Morgan County Whigs in March, 1843, the following resolutions among others were adopted and ordered sent to Governor Duncan:¹¹

1. *Resolved*, That we do not object to a fair expression of the popular will, either through primary meetings, or conventions so constituted as to time, place, and representation, as to secure its proper expression.

2. *Resolved*, That when said will is expressed, it merits the most serious consideration; and that private feelings and individual views and preferences should yield to it unless it involves the sacrifice of principle.

3. *Whereas*, We believe that a late political document conveys the idea that Gov. Duncan would be unwilling to accept a nomination at the hands of the people expressed through a convention; and whereas, we believe that such an idea does not properly express the views of Gov. Duncan: Therefore,

Resolved, That Gov. Duncan, and also Judge Lockwood and Gen. Hardin, be requested to express their views to the Whigs of the district, in relation to the convention system, and whether they will consent to be candidates if chosen by the convention.

Duncan's reply to these resolutions embodies the sum total of all the opposition to the convention, besides incidentally touching on political issues about which little is known at the present time; it is therefore given in full

¹¹ Duncan's reply is found in the *Alton Telegraph* for May 13, 1843, and also in the note at the end of this paper.

in a note at the close of this paper. Hence I shall summarize it very briefly, calling attention only to those objections which seem to have been the principal article of faith of the opposition.

Being unable to deny that the nominating convention had concentrated voting strength, and hence had secured political successes, Duncan was compelled to ignore the question of expediency and attempt to point out the dangers to the government which would result from the use of the system. To his way of thinking, nominating conventions presupposed political parties, which were not only unnecessary in a republican form of government but were dangerous to the liberties of the people. Granting the legitimacy of the convention, its personnel had been, and would no doubt continue to be, of such a nature that the free expression of the party could not be ascertained. And finally if it be granted that the will of the people should be expressed in the convention, the necessity of close organization would bring about the development of the professional politician whose very existence would depend upon office and its patronage.

The evils pointed out by Mr. Duncan were too remote to have any very considerable weight in determining the attitude of the party toward the convention system. The rank and file of the Whigs desired success, and naturally looked to the leaders for successful guidance. Whatever scruples these leaders may have had were swept away by the necessity of leading the party to victory. To continue their leadership victories must be won, and to win them the nominating convention system, which was perhaps the greatest single factor in bringing success, was taken up and used as a means of concentrating voting strength.

To summarize in a paragraph, one can say that the Whigs were ostensibly opposed to the nominating convention until the year 1839, at which time many county and State conventions were held. Prior to this time, the op-

position had been largely of mere political expediency, for the old line Whigs seem to have had no scruples in changing their attitude when it appeared worth while to do so. Not so, however, with that element of the party which had come over from the Democrats between 1830 and 1834. Its defection from the Jacksonian ranks had a beginning in the opposition to the Convention of 1831, and ever afterwards it was the nucleus around which all those opposed to the system grouped themselves. By the early forties this element had become relatively small, and with its ever decreasing influence came an increasing demand for the convention system. The stand made in 1842 by ex-Governor Duncan against overwhelming odds marks the real end of any considerable opposition to the nominating convention by the Whigs of Illinois.¹²

Note.—Duncan's reply to the resolutions adopted by the Morgan County Whigs in March, 1843, is as follows:

Elm Grove.

Gentlemen:—You will see by the foregoing resolutions, passed at a meeting of the Whigs of this county on the 22d of March, that I have been called upon to give my views to the Whigs of this Congressional District in relation to the convention system, and also, to say whether I will consent to be a candidate, if chosen by the convention. These resolutions also allude to an address made to the people of the State by Messrs. Lincoln, Logan and Bledsoe, which was prepared in obedience to a resolution of a Whig meeting of members of the Legislature and other citizens at the capitol, on the fourth of March. It does not, however, appear to have been presented to, or approved of, by the meeting, but was published in the Journal of the 10th.

I beg leave, before answering either of the inquiries put to

¹² See *Alton Telegraph* for February 25, March 11 and 25, April 1 and 15, and May 6 and 13, 1843. For the attitude of *Quincy Whig*, *Alton Telegraph*, *Charleston Courier*, and *Sangamo Journal*, all Illinois papers, on the question of the convention system about 1842, see *Sangamo Journal*, October 8, 1841.

me, to notice some of the arguments, facts and conclusions of that address in favor of the convention system; which I shall do, however, with reluctance, because some of them, though certainly not so intended, are considered rather reproachful to myself: and although I may point out some errors, and shall endeavor to refute the arguments and statements it contains with candor, it shall be in a spirit of the utmost kindness. This address strongly urges the convention system, and says:—"Whether it is right in itself, we do not stop to inquire; contenting ourselves with trying to show, that while our opponents use it, it is madness in us not to defend ourselves with it. For example, look at the elections of last year. Our candidate for Governor, with the approbation of a large portion of his party, took the field without a nomination, and in open opposition to the system. Whereever in the counties the Whigs had held conventions, and nominated candidates for the Legislature, the aspirants, who were not nominated, were induced to rebel against the nominations and to become candidates, as it is said, 'on their own hook.' " This statement is generally understood, as intended to convey the idea, that my refusal to submit to a convention, had defeated the Whig party in this State at the election last summer, which I think an error; and the intimation that I had forced myself into the field, with the approbation of only a portion of the party, and that candidates for the Legislature in some of the counties were induced to rebel against nominations by conventions, either by my advice or example, is certainly incorrect, and if intended as a censure, is equally unjust. The Sangamo Journal, of the 30th March, contains an article also addressed to the Whig party, from which I make the following extract, leaving you to make the application. After urging the Whigs to adopt the convention system, it says:—"If any are foolhardy enough to run as independent candidates, let them enjoy the singularity they court, and remain independent and alone; in almost every instance they meet the fate they deserve; and while they involve themselves in political death, amid *merited obloquy and scorn*, we shall regret to see any portion of the Whig party connected with them. Banish from your ranks the selfish, and time-serving politician, who, not satisfied with his own disgrace, would desire your misfortunes to cover his own defeat."

It is a fact known to many, that a large number of both political parties solicited me to become a candidate for Governor, as early as the winter of 1840-1, expressing their confidence that I could do something towards relieving the State from the embarrassments which I had so often predicted, and had so anxiously attempted to avert, while I was Governor before. Under such influences, and with the hope that I might be able to do something, if elected by a union of both parties upon the State policy, among other good results, to allay party spirit, I made up my mind to become a candidate, provided the Whigs presented no other person; but during the fall and summer of 1841, Col. Davidson, Mr. Lincoln, Gen. Thornton, myself, and others, were all placed before the public, and a convention was proposed to settle our respective claims. Having no wish from personal motives, either to be a candidate, or to hold the office again, and believing that defeat would be inevitable to any one nominated by a convention on party grounds, as the Whigs were in a minority of 7,000 or 8,000, I requested Mr. Lucas to announce that I would not be a candidate; which he did in the *Illinoian* in November, 1841. About this time I left home for New York; and on my return in 1842, in place of "taking the field," I found that all those gentlemen had withdrawn, and that my name, without my knowledge, had been placed before the public by most of the Whig presses and by popular meetings of the people. Thus made a candidate, I employed every honorable means in my power, not only to secure my own election, but to harmonize our friends; and instead of defeating the party, although I may not have received much support from some of those who were anxious for a convention, the vote I received was usually much larger than that given to other Whig candidates in the counties, and in some instances where Van Buren men were elected, I had large majorities over my opponents.

But as my defeat is so much relied upon, as an argument in favor of the convention system, it may not be amiss to inquire whether this defeat cannot be accounted for in some other way, than the want of a convention nomination; and in my opinion it can. Does any one doubt that Mr. Van Buren's two trips across the State, just before the election, was intended to have, and did have, the effect to rally his party, many of whom, up to that time,

were warmly supporting my election? In addition to this, my not having visited him when in Jacksonville, was magnified into a gross and personal insult, and was published all over the State for the purpose of exciting his party against me. All the public officers, and politicians of his party in the State, were put in motion; and Young and Reynolds used the Congressional franks, to flood the State with vile slanders against the Whig party and in support of my opponent. The Whigs were generally disheartened by their defeat in other States; most of the politicians taking no part in the elections, while others were bowing and scraping to, and parading over the country with Mr. Van Buren — a fact which my opponent did not fail to notice in his speeches, as the most conclusive evidence, that all the previous charges made by the Whigs against him were false and hypocritical — which he illustrated by telling of a son of one of the leading Whigs, who, on Mr. Van Buren's arrival at Springfield, seeing his father rush through the crowd and seize him by the hand, did not doubt, from what he had often heard his father say of Mr. Van Buren, that he was taking him to jail, and ran home, crying, "Mother! mother! they have got the traitor at last!"

Morgan county is named in the address as one of the counties where the Whigs were defeated at the last election, by a rebellion of disappointed candidates against the nomination of a convention. The convention in this county, I learn, was composed of but few individuals; and several precincts were unrepresented. I understand that the first resolution they passed, was an act of proscription, declaring that no one should be nominated for any office he had ever held before; and that some of the persons refused to accept. Is there any thing in this to favor conventions? Certainly not. It only shows the great danger and impropriety of interfering with the elective franchise of men, who are resolved to think for themselves. Notwithstanding the denunciations sent forth in advance, and all that may be anticipated, I must continue to express my opposition to what is called the convention system, such as was established by Mr. Van Buren, and has been practiced by his party for the last twelve years, and which is now recommended by a portion of our friends to be adopted by the Whig party as a measure of defense. Whatever may be the motive of this recommendation, we all know that the

love of power is insatiable; that power is constantly stealing from the many to the few; and that the convention system, as used by the Van Burenites, is nothing more nor less than a contrivance of government officers, of office seekers, and men who make politics a trade, to take the selection of all public agents from the people, leaving them nothing to do but to vote as the leaders or drill-masters tell them. I admit to the fullest extent, the right, and on great occasions, the propriety, of the people to hold public conventions, either *en masse* or by representatives, to act or deliberate upon any subject that may interest them: and I hold that a measure or candidate, agreed upon by compromise, or a recommendation of such a convention, when it is known fairly to represent the wishes of the people or of a party, should have great weight with all, who in the main, agree with them in opinion. Acting upon this principle, it is well known, that when delegates were sent from every part of the Union to the Harrisburg Convention in 1839, to deliberate upon measures to drive Van Buren, (who had degraded, corrupted, and almost ruined the country,) from the Capitol, that I advanced fifty dollars to defray the expenses of the representatives from this State; and, although my favorite candidate was not selected, I gave Gen. Harrison the most cordial support. Here was a great occasion.

The usurpations, corruptions, and mal-administration of Government had roused the people in every part of the Union, and we all hoped that the success of the Whig party at that election would sweep Van Burenism and all its evils, from the country. It was not to be so. Although he was defeated by near 150,000 majority, the blight is still upon us. But I protest against being made responsible for it in the remotest degree.

For twelve years I have been opposing the corrupting and anti-republican policy of Mr. Van Buren, the great lever of which, was this inquisition, or convention system, which he commenced establishing over the whole Union for the first time, while Secretary of State under Gen. Jackson. The office holders, the office seekers, and thousands of unprincipled demagogues, influenced by the power and patronage of the government, flocked to his standard, and were employed in organizing the friends of Gen. Jackson and those of the Secretary, into a drilled and servile party, which they then christened and have since called the Demo-

cratic party. Conventions were resorted to as the best means of perfecting this organization; and denunciation, proscription, slander and persecution, were the weapons freely used against all, and especially against the original supporters of Gen. Jackson, who opposed his ambitious views. Can stronger evidence of the evils and dangers of the convention system be desired, than the well known fact of Mr. Van Buren, a man without merit or claim upon the country, having wormed himself into the Presidential chair by it, and, in doing so, spread more corruption and discord through the country, and did more to destroy confidence in our free institutions, both at home and abroad, than he and all his friends would be able to repair if they should live a thousand years. Universal history proves that party spirit, even in its best form, when dictated by patriotism, in moments of excitement has often been made the instrument of much evil and of great oppression. Who can doubt after the experience we have had, that the organization of people into parties, on the selfish, vindictive and proscriptive principles of Van Buren, is just as dangerous to the liberty, peace and safety of every honorable and independent citizen, as a large mercenary army of regular soldiers would be to the liberty and peace of the whole country? I consider that the Whigs, who have so long and honorably opposed this corrupt and dangerous system, would be just as unwise and inconsistent to adopt it now, even in self-defence, as this government would be to establish and maintain large standing armies in time of peace, because hereditary monarchs opposed to popular government employ them. If we are to be made slaves, it matters not whether our masters come from the ranks of our friends or our enemies. I do, therefore, as a Whig, and as a citizen, ardently desiring the happiness and prosperity of the whole country, protest against this odious convention system, or any other principle of action, however plausibly it may be urged, "without stopping to inquire whether it is right;" and I dissent entirely from an opinion also expressed in this address, that "they can see nothing wrong in applying the convention system to the nomination of candidates for small offices in nowise connected with parties." This, I suppose has particular reference to legislative conventions, such as are usually held in the *slaughter pen*, (as it is aptly termed) by the Van Buren party, in which the leading politicians of that

party about the seat of government, during the session of the Legislature, assemble at night to decide upon the claims of partisans, and also upon measures and elections that should be discussed and enacted by the whole Legislature. I can view this slaughter pen or inquisition in no other light, than as an avenue through which men in power will some day lead their opponents to the block or the guillotine.

It is against the spirit of freedom and of our constitution for a minority to rule; yet by this contrivance a few active politicians about the seat of government, such as has been the case with the Kitchen Cabinet at Washington, and the Regency at Albany, can govern the legislation and manage all appointments to office.

An organized party, like an army, must have captains, subalterns, and drill masters, who are commonly styled Committees of Vigilance, and expect to be rewarded for their services when successful, out of the spoils. Thus stimulated by ambition and self-interest, they meet in secret, without individual responsibility or fear of detection, and then devise means for destroying their opponents, and for deceiving and managing the people. They are inquisitorial judges of the merits and demerits of all persons in office, and recommend rewards or punishments, not according to services rendered and to be rendered to the country, but to the party. Those leaders dictate what men and measures the party are to support; and being themselves most interested in the issue, when hard pressed resort to desperate expedients. By their peculiar situation and influence over the party for whom they act, they may with impunity promise and confer the highest military honors, grant the public arms, and the most extraordinary powers; and doubtless will, if nothing less can secure success, give the control of the government itself, to any general, priest, or prophet, as a bribe for votes enough to place their party in power. If any one supposes such a thing impossible, let them look at the political movements and legislation in our own State for the last two or three years; let them see the cringing of ambitious office seekers of both parties at the feet of the Mormon Prophet; especially since he published his manifesto, in the shape of a proclamation, declaring that he and his followers "cared not a fig for Whigs or Democrats; that they are both alike to them; that they

would go for their friends, their tried friends — those who served them they would serve again." It is the avowal of such principles, and by the whole legion acting and voting as one man, that this bold adventurer, in the short space of three years, has obtained control over the elections in several counties, in at least one congressional district, and at a general election, over the whole State. Formidable as this Mormon Prophet is becoming, his is not the only power ambitious of political sway, that he may take advantage of our divisions. All know that there is another large and powerful church in this country, whose faith in its head is also superior to their political opinions; and we see by repeated accounts of late from Europe, that extensive arrangements are now making to send millions of his subjects to this country.

By this party drill, the rank and file are forced to ratify every bargain made by their leaders, however repugnant it may be to their feelings, rather than split from this party, and be called traitors to their principles; for experience has shown that most men would sacrifice their country, and compromise their honor, or their principles, sooner than encounter the sneers, much less the obloquy and scorn of a party, after having firmly enlisted under its banners. This convention system, if adopted by both parties, will make our government a prize to be sought after by political gamblers. It throws the chains of slavery and degradation around its votaries, prostrates the fine feelings of nature, extinguishes every spark of patriotism, creates jealousies, distrusts, and angry divisions in society, and will ultimately make us an easy prey to some fiend, or despot, at the head of an army or church, whose followers, like themselves, love the spoils of power better than the liberty of their country.

When those slaughter-pen conventions are held exclusively by members of the Legislature, a majority of the party holding them — which party may be barely a majority of the whole — they dictate measures which two-thirds of the Legislature might be opposed to; by which means a large portion of the Representatives are arbitrarily deprived of their constitutional rights to participate in the adoption of measures to which they and their constituents are bound to submit. These conventions teach the people to lean upon the politicians instead of investigating, acting and thinking for themselves. They will always give the party in

power great advantages over their opponents, and will enable the President of the United States, when at the head of either of the great parties, by the use of his patronage and power, nine times out of ten to re-elect himself, or to designate his successor; and it will always enable the most corrupt and active politician, who promises most offices, to get himself nominated in county or district conventions.

In fact, I look upon the convention system as designed by its authors to change the government from the free will of the people into the hands of designing politicians, and which must in a short time drive from public employment, every honest man in the country. Is it not so to a great extent already? Witness the number of unprincipled and incompetent men which it has brought into office, and into the councils of the country. Congress is a little less than a disorderly mob, and legislatures have degraded and ruined the country. Who are we required to organize ourselves against? Are they not our friends, brothers and countrymen? It is true, designing demagogues have poisoned their minds, excited their prejudices, and by party trammels have led them on to injure us, themselves, and their country; but time, forbearance, persevering in well-doing on our part, must convince the honest portion of our opponents that we are true friends to our country. A long period of deception and bad government on the part of their leaders, has opened the eyes of many; and it is to be hoped that they will soon throw off all party prejudice, and judge of public men by the honesty and wisdom of their measures. They will then judge correctly between the patriot, who delights in the honor, prosperity and happiness of his country, and the selfish miscreant who would divide it into parties, excite sectional and personal prejudices, array brother against brother, father against son, and the rich against the poor, that they, poor short-sighted wretches, might fill, for a season, some pitiful office. Such men we have among us; and I never witness the intrigues and management of one of them, without feeling the pity and contempt due to an incendiary, who would fire and desolate a city merely to plunder a single shop.

Can any man at this day doubt that there is intelligence, patriotism and virtue enough in the Whig party, or in both parties, to sustain our free institutions, and carry on the govern-

ment as our fathers did, without resorting to this party drill, or without putting on the shabby old coat of Locofocoism, which all honest men among them are now getting ashamed of, made up as it is of sneers, intrigues, denunciations, and dictations of men, seeking by such means to bring the people under the control of party leaders? For myself, (and I believe it is the sentiment of every true Whig,) "I had rather enjoy one day, one hour, of virtuous liberty, than to live an eternity in bondage."

It is my deliberate opinion, formed by long observation of the spirit of the Van Buren party, that if the Whigs shall now consent to organize and act upon the same principles, that elections in this country will become as corrupt as they are in the rotten boroughs of England; and that the government will soon end in angry contests, civil war, and perhaps in despotism. All know the advantage that organization, subordination, and discipline, give regular troops over raw militia; but experience has shown that citizens, who feel it to be no less a privilege than a duty to defend their country, though often routed, have rarely been vanquished by a mercenary army, however well appointed. Who doubts that if the Whigs remain firm in maintaining the laws, the constitutions and free institutions of the country, showing on all occasions a patriotism above all selfish or party triumphs, that the virtuous portion of all parties will throw off the shackles which party machinery has imposed upon them? Then they will as before 1830, when the republic was pure, and as in 1840, march to the polls like freemen, and vote for men and measures on their own judgment. Then those little, intriguing politicians, who have of late acquired such consequence from their participation in the management of elections, (while honest men who support the government by the sweat of their brow, are at home attending to their business,) will have to go to work, or sink into the insignificance and contempt which await the loafer and selfish hypocrite! As this address has narrowed the contest between us and the Van Buren party down to three questions, to-wit: the bank, tariff, and distribution, which I consider of minor importance, I feel bound before closing this letter, to state what I consider the most important points at issue between the parties, because, unless the breaches lately made and discovered by politicians in our

Constitution are repaired, any law to protect our own industry, or to regulate the currency, will be little better than a dead letter upon the statute books.

The Whig party, as I understand their principles, are for maintaining the supremacy of the law and constitution; and hold any public officer to be an enemy to his country, who usurps authority or exercises power not clearly conferred upon him by one or the other.

We are for maintaining inviolate chartered rights and the public faith.

We are for strict economy in carrying on the government.

We are in favor of a tariff, or a tax, to support government; being levied first upon such articles as come in competition with those made in our own country; next upon all articles of luxury, leaving free of tax as far as is consistent, articles of necessity, such as are required by every family.

We are for a well guarded bank, chartered by the United States, to act as a fiscal agent of the government, to regulate our currency and assist commerce, to be owned and directed chiefly by private stock-holders, who shall be responsible to Congress, or its special agent, for their strict observance of the law and their fidelity to the government.

We are for reducing executive patronage. We believe that public officers were created to serve the country, and their duties should be defined by law; so that the president should have no power over them, except when unfaithful or incompetent.

We believe that every private citizen and public officer should be left free to speak, act and vote according to his own judgment; and that he who attempts to control, or by an exercise of power or management of any kind, to abridge those rights, is guilty of an assault upon public liberty.

We are opposed to proscription, and removals of competent public agents for their political opinions, by the executive government, because it degrades and enslaves the public officer, takes away his responsibility to the law and the people, and makes him at will, the servile tool of men in power.

We are opposed to the ostracism practiced by Mr. Van Buren, which drove from the service of the country, many of our best, most talented, and useful citizens.

We are in favor of amending the constitution, to limit the presidential office to one term, in order to deprive the President of all motive to indulge an improper ambition.

We are opposed to executive appointments of members of Congress to office, because we have had abundant evidence that it corrupts and destroys the independence of the people's representatives, and turns their eyes from their constituents to the government.

We are for some efficient plan to keep the press and judiciary free from executive influence.

We are opposed to all executive control over public money until appropriated by law; because the Constitution wisely intended to make Congress or their agent the keeper of the public funds; and common sense teaches us that money, the lever of all power, should never be lodged with one who wields the patronage and directs the arms of the country.

We are opposed to all government banks, sub-treasuries and exchequers, because either of them must greatly extend executive power, and because experience has shown that politicians, (and all government officers are of late made politicians) are not to be trusted with money.

Whenever these things can be effected, and the people shall once more prefer the success and prosperity of the whole country to the triumphs of party, our Government will be pure, our liberties safe, and the people united, prosperous and happy.

My answer to the inquiry, whether I will, if chosen by the convention to be held in this congressional district, accept the nomination, is, that I have no wish at this time to enter public life. I believe that every man in the country has the right to offer for any office he pleases; that he has also the right to vote for whom he pleases; that the people have the right to meet in conventions and nominate candidates; but I recognize in them no power to make me vote for a man that I do not believe to be honest, or support a measure that I do not think best for the country; nor to commit me in any way against my judgment or my principles; and if I were anxious to be a candidate, which is most sincerely not the case, I could not with my present views accept a nomination from a convention of any organized party.

I also admit the entire right of such as may feel offended,

(though I declare no personal offence has been intended) to denounce me as much as they please for this letter, which has been written under a strong sense of duty, and not without much pain at being compelled to differ with so many of my best friends.

JOSEPH DUNCAN.

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN EDUCATION BEFORE THE REVOLUTION¹

BY M. W. JERNEGAN

It is a well known fact that writers on the history of education have been less successful in presenting their particular topic than those in other special fields, such as religion, slavery, or constitutional history. This may be due to the fact that educational history has been neglected by historical scholars, and that many of the writers who have attempted to set forth this phase of our history have approached the subject rather from a philosophical than a purely historical standpoint. In many cases, these authors have not been trained as historians; and their books give evidence of a lack of knowledge of the sources from which educational history must be written, as well as a lack of training in interpreting the sources which they have used — particularly in failing to discuss important factors which must be considered if the history of education is to be well written. The fact is, the history of education, like the history of religion, must be written with sufficient historical background, and sufficient emphasis on other phases of man's social activity, to make clear all the forces that have essentially influenced what we call educational history in its narrower sense. If the subject were looked upon from this standpoint by the historian with special training, more monographs and histories, of which there is great need, would doubtless

¹ The purpose of this paper is to present some of the author's ideas relative to the method of treating American educational history. The views here set forth will be further illustrated in a work, now in preparation, covering the general history of American education before the Revolution.

make their appearance. It is quite useless to expect in general histories any adequate account of the evolution of the American people, until this important phase of their life has been thoroughly studied by those competent to treat it as a phase of our general social history.

Our conception of what factors may have influenced the progress of education before the Revolution is largely determined by our notions of what is meant by the term "education". A narrow conventional view would confine the subject to a description of organized institutions of learning, subject matter and methods of instruction, and the theory or philosophy underlying educational systems. Often a history of education contains little more than an exposition of the last element. There are several reasons for this. It is much easier to set forth the views of such writers as Plato, Rousseau, Locke, or Spencer, than it is to consult a large number of manuscripts and books and present a history of the evolution of an educational system, with the reasons therefor, and its relation to the general evolution of society. Again, the search for a philosophy of education is of such importance that every effort has been made to compel history to yield up the secret. The argument runs as follows: Social progress results from developing the personality of man according to certain ethical standards. To formulate a philosophy of education, the application of which to educational practice will conduce to this development is the goal to be reached. The study of previous educational theories and philosophies will help us to formulate one for our own use, and the study of systems of education based on these philosophies will aid us in finding methods applicable to present use. Accordingly the history of education in the American Colonies might be a philosophical discussion of the various theories or ideals which seem to underly their educational development. This, however, would be a history of educational theory. It would bear much the same

relation to educational history proper as the history of economic theory in America bears to the economic history of America. It is, of course, important and necessary to know the history of educational theory. The conclusions of some thinkers and teachers pass more or less into practice, and modify or change materially prevailing systems and ideals. On the other hand, it is clear that a study of the views of educational reformers or theorists is unlikely to inform us of actual contemporary practice in any particular generation, for a new theory rarely passes rapidly into practice. Moreover, prevailing ideals and practices are the result of forces which have their roots deep in the past; while educational institutions and ideals, the curriculum and methods of instruction are largely inherited. They are perpetuated by the prevailing sentiment of communities and school officials, who, through habit, imitate preceding practices. Again, established institutions, especially the church and school are slow to adopt new ideas. Indeed, the persistence of established ideas and customs is one of the characteristic features of all human institutions. We must consider, therefore, other influences than educational theory — such as race, economic, political, social, literary, intellectual, and particularly religious factors — all of which tend to perpetuate, modify, or change prevailing practices. Reformers and writers are often generations ahead of their time, while these influences may be generations before them. So also the ideals of the teaching force, the methods, the text-books used, and the curriculum as a whole, are to a large extent based on the ideals and achievements of previous generations. It is clear, then that to enumerate the factors that influence the progress of education in any country, one must take into consideration a great variety of facts and forces. This view means that educational development is dependent on all the factors which influence human life and progress.

The most important contributory factors which influenced the educational development of each Colony were ethnic or race elements — including inherited ideas or practices and the spirit of the race; environment — including geographical conditions, climate and physiography; economic conditions — including distribution of land and population, industrial organization, and economic well being; religion — including the relation of church and state, religious motives for education, and the influence of religious sects in promoting and controlling education; political conditions — including the relation of state and education, and the influence of forms of local government, such as town or parish; social conditions — including home influences, social classes and groups; and intellectual conditions — including the proportion of educated men to the total population, average intelligence of the race, and the means of distributing knowledge, such as printing, libraries, and newspapers. In other words, the factors influencing the education of a generation are in large part the contributory agencies and influences named above, not merely the subject matter studied in the school and college. The progress of education is dependent on all these factors and others not mentioned. In short, to understand its real development, we must know the reaction of geographical, economic, religious, political, social, and intellectual influences on education in its narrower meaning. To understand, then, the history of education in America before the Revolution, we must first know the philosophy or underlying motives of the education provided; second, we must discover the relative influence of the contributory factors on the development of educational institutions and practices; and third, we must have a descriptive account of the evolution of such institutions, and the forces that have aided in bringing them to a common type.

In the light of what has been said it is obvious that

any detailed study of Colonial education must be preceded by a survey of old world social and intellectual conditions, as well as educational theories and practice, particularly in England. We must know what notions and traditions the Colonists started with, in order to determine how far the educational institutions of the new world were reproductions, how far modified by new conditions, and what features were wholly new. It would then be necessary to examine the conditions within each group of Colonies to determine the features of the educational systems common or peculiar to each, with the reasons therefor, how far the groups influenced each other by law or custom, and the processes by which the tendency to educational unity was furthered. This would give us the historical background of the American public school and college.

Let us now pass to the application of some of these principles as shown in the development of educational institutions in New England and the Southern Colonies. A study of the conditions affecting the establishment and progress of educational institutions in Massachusetts will illustrate some of the general principles already set forth. The great migration to Massachusetts from 1628 to 1640 was unique in respect to numbers, purity of race stock, and the general character of the settlers. But a still more important factor influencing educational progress was the nature of the inherited ideas which the Colonists brought with them. Certain intellectual traits and characteristics had their origin in the period of the Reformation. It placed emphasis on the worth of the individual man and encouraged the right of private judgment, especially with respect to the interpretation of the Scriptures. The desire to read the Bible and to have the children grow in the faith of their fathers was one of the most important inherited characteristics brought from England by the Puritans. Moreover, the struggle between the Churchmen and Dissenters had brought forth a flood of contro-

versial literature, with the corresponding desire to read and understand it. This was an additional stimulus favoring education. Besides these general conditions we know that the second and third generation from the English Reformation had lived through a remarkable educational movement. As a result of the dissolution of the monasteries and the passage of the Chantries Act of 1547, at least three hundred grammar and elementary schools connected with religious institutions lost their endowments by confiscation.² The general effect was a sudden cessation of the principal agencies for elementary and secondary education. As a result of this situation a great philanthropic movement started, which provided endowments for as many or more grammar and elementary schools, newly founded or refounded between 1548 and 1640.³ Thus not only do we have an historical background for a sentiment for educational institutions, but in these schools many of the Puritans received more or less of their education. Some had acted in the capacity of governors or teachers. Thus they had knowledge at first hand of some of the educational institutions in England that most influenced those established in the Colonies. They knew from experience something of their methods of support, administration, and curriculum, together with their relation to the church, state, and university. The habit of living in villages grouped about a church, whose pastor was often the religious and intellectual leader of each society, was inherited and reproduced in the new homes of the Colonists. This method of group settlement, taken in connection with the religious motive for education, helps to explain much of the community action on education. Of this more will be said later.

But there were other forces influencing the develop-

² The best account of this whole movement is found in Leach's *English Schools at the Reformation*.

³ See the writer's manuscript account of *The Development of Elementary and Secondary Education in England, 1550-1640*.

ment of educational institutions in Massachusetts besides those which were inherited. It is a well known fact that human institutions are greatly influenced by the effect of their environment. Though the Colonists inherited a religious motive and sentiment for education, and the instinct for gathering about a common center, yet these factors alone would probably not have been sufficient to guarantee further progress. The proof of this is seen in a different development of educational institutions in the Southern Colonies. In New England, however, climate, soil, and physiography furthered these beliefs and practices. The severe winters, the lack of good inland communication, good harbors, and the narrow fringe of open country along the coast all induced settlement in community groups. These factors influenced the General Court to plan their land system to fit the environment.

The methods of distributing land have had a powerful influence on the development of American institutions. In this case, the General Court adopted principles which compelled settlement in groups on tracts of land of forty or more square miles each. The townships were laid out contiguous to each other, and no more land was granted than could be profitably used. Individual grants were made sparingly and in small amounts, and after the first generation but rarely.⁴ All this had an important bearing on the development of educational institutions. For example, among other things, it affected the distribution of population, compelling a density not found elsewhere in the Colonies. This affected the development of the principle of taxing all the people of a town for a common public school. Had the land system of New England been like that of the South, the population would certainly have been much more scattered. The difficulty of securing agreement on matters of common interest in those towns

⁴ See Eggleston's *Land Systems of the New England Colonies* in *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, Series IV.

with a sparse population, or where it was unevenly distributed, is well known.

In New England an institution called the "Moving School"⁵ was one effect of the scattering of population in the early eighteenth century. The "Moving School" came into existence because those families who moved to the outlying districts of the town, on account of the increase of population or scarcity of good lands, objected to taxation for a public school with no corresponding benefit. The distance to the school kept at the center was so great, that children could not well attend, especially in the winter season. Accordingly the outlying villages, or groups, demanded a portion of the time of the teacher. Thus, instead of having one good school at the center, the teacher often taught only one to three months in each of the several outlying portions of the town. This system brought about a serious decline of education in New England, was the forerunner of the district school, and gives further evidence of the effect of a scattered population on the progress of education. It might be noted here that the present movement to transport children from outlying districts at public expense to good schools in the centers of population, is an interesting attempt to counteract the effect of a thinly distributed population. In the seventeenth century, however, the industrial organization of New England, the small farm, settlement on the coast, the commercial and fishing interests, fear of the Indians, abundance of land, and difficulty of settling in the back country — all these conditions kept the population concentrated in small groups on a comparatively small area of land.

The action of several of the Massachusetts towns established before 1642 resulted in the founding of some schools before the Colony took any action respecting education. It is certain that the development of town gov-

⁵ See Updegraff's *The Origin of the Moving School in Massachusetts*.

ernment had a remarkable influence on the progress of town schools. The habit of legislating for the common good, such as raising money for support of religion, roads, the poor, and other matters, naturally influenced appropriations for the common school. The social forces operating in this frontier community also made for democracy in education. In New England social classes were not so clearly defined as in the South because of the absence of a large slave and indentured servant element.

It must be remembered, too, that the people were drawn together weekly at the meeting house. Here was a religious social fact influencing community action, which was perhaps the most important single force bearing on educational progress. The relation between the political and religious aspects of the New England town is one of great interest in its bearing on educational development. If the truth could be learned, it is probable that much of the sentiment in the towns for the support of education came from the element in the town meeting that was most anxious for large appropriations for the support of the church. The religious motive for having their children taught to read, that they might study the Scriptures, has already been commented upon. There was always one man in every town who would throw his whole influence towards town support of education, and he was the minister. In the early towns, he was often a university man, a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge, often a graduate of Harvard. Religion appears as a factor in the educational acts passed by the General Court. Almost without exception, it is stated in each act that one of the principal reasons for its passage is the desire to promote religion.

The intellectual factors affecting the progress of education in Massachusetts are by far the most important. We must consider the influence and personality of nearly one hundred university graduates of Oxford and Cambridge who settled in New England before 1650, most of

whom acted as pastors of churches. Too little attention has been paid to their intellectual leadership in accounting for the development of New England educational institutions.⁶

The great migration to Massachusetts between 1630 and 1640 was unique, not only in numbers and in the average character of the emigrants, but particularly in the proportion of university graduates. The progress of civilization depends primarily on the ability and energy of its leaders, and no Colony ever had a larger proportion of able, educated men than Massachusetts. Nearly three-fourths were from the University of Cambridge, where such men as John Robinson, Oliver Cromwell, and John Milton had received a part of their education. Twenty of these leaders were educated in Emanuel College, Cambridge — among them John Cotton, Nathaniel Ward, Thomas Shepard and John Harvard. John Winthrop, the elder, attended Trinity, and Henry Dunster, the first president of Harvard, graduated from Magdalen College. The migration is commonly reckoned at 20,000, or 4000 families. Thus there would be one person in forty families, or one for every two hundred emigrating, who had received university training. It is estimated that Massachusetts, with a population of 9000, had nearly fifty university men. Moreover, at least one-half were within a radius of a few miles of Boston or Cambridge. It is safe to say that such a concentration of educated men, in a new settlement, has never been duplicated. They were the intellectual leaders who gave the community its educational ideals, influenced the passage of the educational acts, and urged their enforcement. Knowing these facts, we can understand why the public school, a printing press, and a college were established in Massachusetts before 1640.

The founding of Harvard College in 1636 was not an

⁶ Dexter's *Influence of English Universities in the Development of New England* in the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1879-1880, pp. 340-352.

accident. It came when and where it did, because of the necessity of providing for an educated ministry. A failure to found a college within two generations would have been a calamity from the Puritan standpoint. In that period most of these English bred university men would have passed away and in the main an uneducated ministry would have taken their place. Moreover, the stimulus toward the founding of elementary and grammar schools would have been lacking in part without the university. The famous law of Massachusetts of 1647, providing that towns of fifty householders should provide a person to teach children to read and write, and towns of one hundred householders should set up a grammar school to fit pupils for the university, probably had its origin, in part at least, in the desire to provide a system whereby the college could obtain students, who could be fitted to take up the work of the ministry when the older generation of ministers, educated in England, had passed away.

In general, the world that the Puritans of the first generation lived in was unique. Nothing quite like it is to be found in the Middle and Southern Colonies, from the standpoint of population, its distribution, the land system, the local government, social relations, relation of town and church, religious and intellectual leadership, and the relation of the university to all of these factors.

It is quite evident from these illustrations that the important factors influencing the progress of education in Massachusetts were more or less lacking in other Colonies. They suggest how much must be done in the study of our institutional history to account for the varied development not only of educational but of other institutions. The Colonial period of American history has received much attention from the political and constitutional standpoint, and of late years many studies of special subjects have been made for individual Colonies. Less has been written, however, respecting the institu-

tional history of the Colonies from a comparative standpoint. To understand thoroughly the American institutions of to-day, we should know their history in the old world, how they were modified and developed by the transfer to a new environment and how far these institutions were common to all the Colonies, with reasons for differences. We should know, too, the history of the new institutions, the extent to which one Colony adapted to its own use the institutions of another, and what modifications, if any, were made.

This leads us to inquire why the development of educational institutions in the American Colonies should have varied so widely. Why should the Colonists of Virginia or South Carolina, with essentially the same inherited characteristics and educational background, have developed their educational institutions on quite different lines? To explain this we must take into consideration a set of factors which did not operate in Massachusetts. This task is not difficult; but before taking up this subject a word must be said in explanation of certain peculiarities of educational development in New England.

The Connecticut and New Haven Colonies were influenced by factors similar to those described in Massachusetts, namely, inherited characteristics, community settlement, environment, distribution of land and population, local government, religion, and, to a less extent, similar intellectual forces. In Massachusetts, the circumstances leading to the founding of Harvard College and the desire to make the educational system a factor in its progress, resulted in greater emphasis on the grammar schools, with less attention to elementary education. In Connecticut the postponement of the establishment of Yale until 1701, produced exactly the opposite development. In this Colony the emphasis was on elementary education, and it far surpassed Massachusetts in this respect.

How easy it is to overestimate general influences in accounting for educational progress, may be seen from a brief examination of the Plymouth Colony and that of Rhode Island. Plymouth Colony was near Massachusetts. It had a similar historical background, environment, system of local government, distribution of land and population, and relation between church and state. The natural conclusion would be that this Colony would have a similar interest in education. This is very far from the truth, however. The state of learning and religion was exceedingly low. In 1658 seven towns out of eleven were without pastors, and six of these towns waited on an average ten years more before settling pastors. No public school had been established in the town of Plymouth up to 1670, and in few if any of the other fifteen towns. Up to 1658 but three natives of this Colony had graduated from Harvard College, and of all the Harvard graduates, the majority of whom had become ministers, but one settled in Plymouth Colony.⁷

These facts show that neither inherited characteristics, environment, nor even a close relation between church and state were sufficient to stimulate educational activity. The factors that brought about this puzzling situation appear to be the following: In the first nine years of the life of the Colony, Brewster was the only university man. There was but one other educated man for some years later. Indeed, until 1658, the total number of such men, who had lived for a longer or shorter period within the bounds of this Colony, was only eighteen.⁸ With few intellectual leaders to stimulate the mass of the people, one of the most important factors present in

⁷ Dexter's *Influence of English Universities in the Development of New England* in the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1879-1880, pp. 344, 345.

⁸ Dexter's *Influence of English Universities in the Development of New England* in the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1879-1880, pp. 344, 345.

Massachusetts was missing. In addition, we have, as a result, a low state of religious life. It is also true that the Plymouth people probably had less average intellectual attainments and ambitions at the start than those of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. This would help to explain their lack of success in attaining economic prosperity — another factor which influenced the general progress of education in this Colony.

Like Plymouth, Rhode Island made little educational progress. Here the most important factor was undoubtedly the prevalence of dissenting sects. The separation of church and state would make it difficult for Catholics, Quakers, and other denominations to agree upon a system of education supported by public taxation. No action was taken by the Assembly toward the passing of a general law on education throughout the whole Colonial period, and even the towns did not give much attention to public schools.

Turning to the Southern Colonies, we find the factors influencing the progress of education to be on the whole adverse to rapid advance. Owing to environment and economic conditions, there was a strong tendency to distribute land to individuals in large tracts. It seemed to be necessary, if staple crops were to be raised in sufficient quantities to exchange the surplus for manufactured products. The plantation system was thus initiated, with the general effect of spreading the population over a large area of territory. The lack of towns, or even centers where a considerable number of families were within a reasonable radius of a given point, effectually prevented the development of a system of schools like that in New England. If the famous act of Massachusetts, passed in 1647, had been enacted by Southern assemblies at any time during the Colonial period, very few elementary schools would have been established, for there would have been comparatively few instances where one could have

found fifty householders within the average area covered by a New England township, or one hundred householders within the same area — the necessary number required for the establishment of a grammar school.

The scattering of population, the lack of easy means of communication, and the system of local government — county and parish — tended to produce independence of action in matters of education; or, in other words, the community spirit exhibited in town meeting and church in New England was much less in evidence in the Southern Colonies. Still another factor was the presence of a large slave and white servant element in the population. The stratification of social classes was thereby intensified, a factor hostile to any system of public education for the benefit of all classes.

It is evident then that educational progress in the Southern Colonies would be in the direction of private rather than public education. The belief took ground that education was for those who could afford to pay for it — others might get along as best they could. There were some exceptions to this rule, but the general principle was well established. In some instances endowed schools were established, free for all children, following the English precedent. But the number of pupils reached by this method was small. The lack of public education, and hence the scarcity of records of the evidence of education of any kind, led Mr. McMaster into a serious error in his estimate of the extent of education in the Southern Colonies before the Revolution — particularly in South Carolina. He said:

“In the Southern States Education was almost wholly neglected, but nowhere to such an extent as in South Carolina. In that Colony prior to 1730, no such thing as a grammar school existed. Between 1731 and 1776 there were five.”⁹

⁹ McMaster's *History of the United States*, Vol. I, p. 27 — reference to Ramsay's *History of South Carolina* as an authority. For a reply to this,

This is an excellent example of how history should not be written because of lack of sufficient data for broad generalization. Mr. McMaster has made four errors in this statement:

(1) Education was not almost wholly neglected in the Southern Colonies before the Revolution; on the contrary education was carried on by private means to a remarkable degree. An illustration of this will be given in considering South Carolina.

(2) South Carolina was not the most backward, but rather the most progressive Southern Colony in the number and character of her schools.

(3) South Carolina did have an important public grammar school from 1712 to 1730, founded by Act of the Assembly and located in Charleston.

(4) Between 1731 and 1776 there were at least eight free schools of grammar grade, many of them in operation the larger part of the period in question.

The evidence for these statements cannot be given here. But the writer has personally examined the original sources, such as Acts of the Assembly, the Parish Vestry books, the wills of founders of schools, and the files of the *South Carolina Gazette*, where there are reports of visitors, advertisements for masters, and other data showing the existence of schools. Not only were there endowed schools but the development of the private school, particularly in Charleston, was far ahead of that in any other city in the Colonies. For example, the files of the *South Carolina Gazette* show that between 1760 and 1770 at least seventy different schools were in operation for a longer or shorter period, many of them covering the whole period in question. It is believed that not less than twenty-five private schools were in operation in Charleston every year from 1760 to the Revolution. This remarkable educational progress must be explained —

see McCrady's *Education in South Carolina Prior to and During the Revolution* in *Collections of the Historical Society of South Carolina*, Vol. IV.

not, as in Massachusetts, by religious motives, nor by the presence of educated leaders, but by the prosperity of the planter class, and the desire to give their children the advantages which wealth and leisure can purchase. One has only to read the files of the *Gazette* to realize what an extensive commerce was carried on and what an enormous amount of capital was invested in slaves.

With a full knowledge of the factors influencing education we may expect aid in understanding one important phase of the evolution of American society. It may help us to solve in part some of the pressing problems of present day education. If we know thoroughly how the present stage has been reached, and the historical reasons for the various problems which are pressing for solution, such as the formulation of a working philosophy, the subject matter of the curriculum, the place of the religious and moral element in education, the character and extent of State control and responsibility, the relation of the school to the church and society — if we understand the historical background of all these problems — we are more likely to solve our present problems successfully.

THE BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

BY PAUL LELAND HAWORTH

Bias is one of the commonest vices among historians, and in few fields of American history are its results more perceptible than in books dealing with the War of 1812. Until the subsidence a dozen years ago of the Anglo-phobia that so long affected Americans, most books on that conflict were so one-sided as to be almost laughable. It is safe to say that the impression prevailing among the great majority of Americans even to-day is that we "licked John Bull good and proper in that war." In fact, that is an impression not infrequently met with among grade teachers of history, at least it was so only recently in New York City. The popular books dealing with the war dwell expansively upon New Orleans and other victories (some of them by no means so unquestioned), and say little of the numerous fiascos about the Niagara and St. Lawrence frontier or of the "Bladensburg races". Unstinted praise is heaped upon the heroes of our little navy, but the books usually forget to emphasize that during the last year of the war most of our chief ports were subjected to so stringent a blockade that it proved almost impossible for our few warships to put to sea. And there was not in our whole navy a single vessel which upon the appearance of a British 74 could do other than crowd on all sail and trust for safety, not to its broadsides, but to the speed of its sea wings.

A hundred years ago this summer, as a result of official incompetence, Indian hostility, and the enterprise of a British general, the United States suffered one of the most humiliating defeats in its history. A campaign be-

gun in the confident expectation of conquering Upper Canada ended in the surrender of Detroit by the senile Hull, and the temporary extinction of American authority throughout a large part of the Old Northwest. This disaster was followed by the so-called "massacre" of the Raisin River and by Indian forays upon the borders. For almost a year William Henry Harrison, an officer whose military talents have often been greatly over-estimated, found it difficult to restrain the enemy from further conquests, much less to recover what had been lost.

In all this warfare the Indians were the chief factor on the British side. The victory of Tippecanoe, instead of being decisive as is often represented, had served merely to enrage the red men. Had it not been for the assistance which Tecumthe and his braves rendered the British, even Hull might have been able to carry out his plans. The Shawnee warrior exacted a heavy price for the Wabash lands, which had caused the first hostilities on the border.

"The precise cost of the Indian war", says Henry Adams, "could not be estimated, being combined in many ways with that of the war with England; but the British counted for little, within the northwestern territory, except so far as Tecumthe used them for his purposes. Not more than seven or eight hundred British soldiers ever crossed the Detroit River; but the United States raised fully twenty thousand men, and spent at least five million dollars and many lives in expelling them. The Indians alone made this outlay necessary."¹

The turning point in the Northwest was the defense of Fort Stephenson. When young Major George Croghan's six-pounder, "Old Betsy", doubly loaded with leaden slugs and grape, enfiladed the crowded ditch in front of her masked port-hole, the British gave up further attempts in Ohio and returned to Detroit and Malden

¹ Adams's *History of the United States*, Vol. VII, p. 141.

across the Lake. The issue, however, could not long have remained doubtful, for Kentucky volunteers were swarming northward under fighting leaders, and the scanty British force, no longer aided so enthusiastically by their red allies, could not long have held their conquests.

There followed soon the naval victory of Lake Erie, which recovered practically all that had been lost and which brought to an end a British scheme for setting up in the Northwest an independent Indian state under guarantee of both nations. No battle of the war was more decisive, and yet the popular idea of the victory is in some respects so erroneous that it may be worth our while to examine the facts concerning it.

The desirability of securing naval control of Lake Erie and the other lakes above the Niagara River was early recognized, but perhaps the original credit for attempting it belongs to a certain Daniel Dobbins, the commander of a merchant vessel named the *Salina*. Dobbins and his vessel were captured at Mackinac when that remote post was surprised at the beginning of the War, but the *Salina* was transformed into a cartel, and Dobbins was permitted to sail in her to Detroit. There he was recaptured, but managed to effect his escape to Presque Isle (Erie, Pennsylvania), traveling most of the way in a frail canoe. The militia general in command at Presque Isle at once sent him to Washington to carry dispatches and give details of the important events of which he had been a witness. His was the earliest intelligence of the surrender of Detroit which the government received. The disappointed Madison, with a military insight that seems unusual in him, at once exclaimed that the United States must obtain the mastery of the Great Lakes. Dobbins was made a sailing-master in the navy, was authorized to draw on the Navy Department for two thousand dollars, and was instructed to proceed to

Presque Isle and begin the construction of gunboats. Returning by way of New York City, he engaged a few ship-carpenters, and on the 26th of September began operations by felling with his own hand a large oak and hewing out the trunk, which was subsequently used as the keel of the *Niagara*.²

Early in September Captain Isaac Chauncey, in command of the navy yard at New York, received orders to take command on Lakes Erie and Ontario. Before leaving New York he ordered Lieutenant Jesse D. Elliott to Lake Erie to select a naval base and to purchase and equip any merchant vessels obtainable that were suitable for war purposes. Elliott reached Buffalo on the 14th of September, and on the 19th of the following month, with about a hundred men in two boats, boarded the British brigs *Detroit* and *Caledonia*, lying under the guns of Fort Erie. The *Caledonia* was safely carried to Black Rock; the *Detroit* was run ashore on Squaw Island and was subsequently burned. It was a gallant exploit dashingy carried out, and its performance, in the opinion of his friends, merited for Elliott the command on Lake Erie that was later given to a younger man. Chauncey reached Sackett's Harbor on the 6th of October, but for some weeks devoted his efforts chiefly to Lake Ontario. When he visited Black Rock toward the end of December, he found that Elliott had equipped there four or five other vessels besides the *Caledonia*. Owing to its nearness to the Canadian shore and its position on the Niagara River, however, Black Rock was not suitable for a naval base, and Chauncey, influenced no doubt by Dobbins, selected Presque Isle as the proper place to build new ships. Early in January he went to Presque Isle and authorized Dobbins to continue his work and build two brigs. Al-

² Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. I, pp. 351-376; Sanborn's *History of Erie*, pp. 222, 241-244; and *The Dobbins Papers* in the *Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society*, Vol. VIII, pp. 259 et seq.

though every stick of timber had to be cut from the stump, Dobbins worked with such energy that by the 14th of March, about the time some additional shipwrights arrived from the East, he was able to report: "The keels of the two brigs are laid or ready to lay. . . . The gunboats two of them are getting the clamps in for the beams in the bottoms Ready for Caulking."³

On the 17th of February Commander Oliver Hazard Perry, an energetic young officer of twenty-seven who had served in the war with Tripoli and who was on gunboat service at Newport, received an order to report to Chauncey, under whom he had already expressed a desire to serve. Chauncey expected that the great naval conflict would occur on Lake Ontario, so he retained command in that region and sent Perry to take charge on Lake Erie. Perry reached Presque Isle on the 27th of March, and at once entered upon his task of completing and equipping the vessels building there and uniting them with the five at Black Rock. Either task was sufficiently difficult. Presque Isle was in a country little better than a wilderness, and supplies and all materials except timber had to be transported from Buffalo, itself a frontier town, or else from Pittsburg up the Allegheny and French rivers, and thence by a wagon road about fifteen miles long, the old French route from Presque Isle to Fort Le Bœuf. A British force under Commander Finnis had complete control of the Lake and ought to have been able to prevent the junction. But Perry displayed skill, combined with great luck. The capture of York (Toronto) on April 27th, and Fort George on May 27th, by Chauncey and Dearborn forced the British to evacuate Fort Erie, and made it possible for Perry, who had assisted in the operations against Fort George, to get his vessels at Black Rock

³ Sanborn's *History of Erie*, p. 246; *The Dobbins Papers* in the *Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society*, Vol. VIII, pp. 263-270, 323, 405-409; Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. I, pp. 351-376.

navy yard up the Niagara River and out into Lake Erie. The British force was passed in a fog, and just as the pursuers came in sight of Presque Isle the last of Perry's vessels entered the harbor. Subsequently the British obligingly raised their blockade temporarily, and enabled Perry, from August 2 to 4, with the skillful assistance of Dobbins and Noah Brown, the master shipwright, to perform the hazardous operation of floating his heavy vessels over the shallow bar out into the Lake.⁴

Perry now had a force of ten vessels, and felt himself strong enough to sail westward to Put-in-Bay. His appearance at the western end of the Lake totally changed the complexion of the military and naval situation in that quarter. As the most powerful British vessel, the *Detroit*, was not yet completed, Commander Robert H. Barclay, a veteran of Trafalgar who had just succeeded Finnis, found his fleet too inferior to risk an action and retired to Malden. On the 25th of August, and again on the 1st of September, Perry appeared off Malden but did not succeed in enticing the enemy out and so returned to Put-in-Bay. As the British fleet and army was dependent upon water communication for supplies, it was inevitable, however, that Barclay must soon risk an action in order to regain control of the Lake.⁵ At sunrise on the 10th of September the lookout at the masthead of Perry's flagship descried the British fleet approaching.

Perry's fleet at this time consisted of nine vessels, the gunboat *Ohio*, commanded by Dobbins, having been sent to Erie for stores. His flagship, which he had named the *Lawrence* in honor of the ill-fated captain who had recently met death upon the *Chesapeake*, was a brig

⁴ Sanborn's *History of Erie*, pp. 245, 246; Roosevelt's *Naval War of 1812* (1898 edition), pp. 254-256; Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. I, pp. 375, 376; Vol. II, pp. 28-42, 62-72; and *The Dobbins Papers* in the *Publications of the Buffalo Historical Society*, Vol. VIII, p. 415.

⁵ Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. II, pp. 73-76; and Kingsford's *History of Canada*, Vol. VIII, p. 309.

of about 480 tons, mounting two long 12-pounders and eighteen 32-pounder carronades. Her sister ship, the *Niagara*, was commanded by Master-Commandant Elliott and her battery was the same as that of the *Lawrence*. A third and lighter brig, the captured *Caledonia*, mounted two long 24-pounders and one 32-pounder carronade. The sloop *Trippe* and the schooners *Ariel*, *Tigress*, *Porcupine*, *Scorpion*, and *Somers* made up the rest of the fleet, which mounted a total of fifty-four guns, throwing a broadside of about 936 pounds of metal. The fleet was manned by about 490 men, of whom only 125 were from the regular navy, the rest being soldiers, landsmen, and a number of free negroes. Almost a fourth of the men were ill with lake fever, cholera morbus, or other ailments and were unfit for duty.*

The British force consisted of six vessels — two ships, two brigs, one schooner, and one sloop. The flagship *Detroit* carried two long 24-pounders, one long 18-pounder, six long 12-pounders, eight long 9-pounders, one short 24-pounder, and one short 18-pounder. The ship *Queen Charlotte* mounted one long 12-pounder, two long 9-pounders, and fourteen short 24-pounders. The brig *Lady Prevost* carried one long 9-pounder, two long 6-pounders, and twelve short 12-pounders. The armaments of the brig *Hunter*, the sloop *Little Belt*, and the schooner *Chippewa* were considerably lighter, that of the *Chippewa* being only one long 9-pounder. Altogether the fleet mounted sixty-three guns, discharging a broadside of about 459 pounds. It was manned by about 440 to 500 men. Perhaps a third were from the royal navy, the rest being Canadians, soldiers, and a few Indians. The chief vessel, the *Detroit*, was much handicapped by lack of cannon primers, necessitating the firing of the guns by snapping flint-lock pistols near the touch-holes, for

* Roosevelt's *Naval War of 1812* (1898 edition), Vol. I, pp. 256-260; and Mackenzie's *Life of Perry*, Vol. I, pp. 215-223.

Barclay's vessels had been fitted out under conditions fully as unfavorable as those which had hampered Dobbins and Perry.⁷

A critical study of the two fleets compels the conviction that the American was decidedly the stronger. The vessels of each were manned by "scratch" crews, approximately equal in numbers and training. Although the British had more guns, their total broadside was only 459 pounds to the American 936 pounds. In long-gun metal the American superiority was "nearly as three is to two, and in carronade metal greater than two to one." The total tonnage of Barclay's six ships was about 1460 tons; of Perry's nine, about 1671 tons. "With such odds in our favor," says Theodore Roosevelt, author of the first critical work on the naval War of 1812, "it would have been a disgrace to have been beaten."⁸

Upon the appearance of the British fleet the American vessels at once weighed anchor, and within an hour were beating out of the bay against a light southwesterly breeze, with the boats assisting by towing. It appeared that the enemy would have the weather-gage, but presently the wind "providentially" shifted to the southeast, giving the Americans the desired advantage. About ten o'clock, when the enemy were five or six miles distant, Perry called the crew of the flagship aft, and, mounting a gun slide, made a short address, after which he unfurled and hoisted amid cheers a large blue burgee, bearing in white letters the words of the dying Lawrence: "Don't give up the ship!"

In expectation of an engagement, Perry had already formed his plan of battle. Perry himself, with the *Lawrence*, was to engage the British flagship *Detroit*; Elliott, with the *Niagara*, the *Queen Charlotte*; the *Caledonia*, the *Lady Prevost*; while the gunboats, which for the most

⁷ Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. II, pp. 77; and Roosevelt's *Naval War of 1812* (1898 edition), pp. 256-261.

⁸ Roosevelt's *Naval War of 1812* (1898 edition), pp. 262, 272.

part were armed with one or more heavy long guns, were to support the larger vessels. Upon seeing the British line, Perry arranged his own with the schooners *Scorpion* and *Ariel* in the van, followed by the *Lawrence*, *Caledonia*, *Niagara*, *Somers*, *Porcupine*, *Tigress*, and *Trippe*, in the order named. The commanders had been enjoined to keep their stations in the line, but to follow the *Lawrence* as closely as possible.⁹

At a quarter before twelve o'clock, while yet a mile distant, the *Detroit* discharged a long 24-pounder at the *Lawrence*. This shot missed, but a second, fired five minutes later, crashed through the *Lawrence's* starboard bulwarks. The first American shot was then fired from the long 32-pounder of the *Scorpion* by Sailing-Master Champlin. Soon after, Lieutenant Packett of the *Ariel*, who had served as a midshipman on the *Constitution* in her fight with the *Java*, discharged a long 12-pounder. Firing then became general, the British concentrating theirs mainly upon the *Lawrence*, which, as she carried only two long twelves, the rest of her battery being carronades, was unable to make a very effective reply. Finding that his vessel was suffering very severely, Perry determined to make increased sail and close as quickly as possible so that he could bring his carronades into play. This maneuver came near proving fatal. The wind was very light, and the *Caledonia*, which was next in line, was so dull a sailer that although the *Scorpion*, *Ariel*, and *Lawrence* forged ahead with considerable rapidity, the *Caledonia* advanced very slowly; Elliott, with the *Niagara*, obedient to Perry's plan of battle, preserved his station in line behind the *Caledonia*, with the other vessels following in the previous order.

Out of this circumstance there later grew a most bitter controversy which has continued even to our own

⁹ Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. II, pp. 76-87; Dawson's *Battles of the United States*, Vol. II, pp. 276-279; and Roosevelt's *Naval War of 1812* (1898 edition), p. 262.

day. Perry and his admirers have contended that the *Niagara* should have disregarded the *Caledonia* and sailed on after the *Lawrence* as rapidly as possible; Elliott and his defenders have pointed to Perry's orders designating the line of battle and to the fact that he made no signal for breaking the line. The force of Perry's own fierce criticisms of Elliott is greatly weakened by the fact that in his detailed report to the Secretary of the Navy he said: "Of Captain Elliott, already so well known to the government, it would be almost superfluous to speak. In this action he evinced his characteristic bravery and judgment."¹⁰ In the light of this statement, Perry's subsequent attacks upon Elliott would seem to have been born of the bitterness engendered by an unfortunate controversy.¹¹

Perhaps it would be correct to say that both commanders were more or less at fault. Perry, in his impetuosity, seems almost to have forgotten that he was the commander of a fleet; and his action in hurrying forward with the *Lawrence*, proper enough had the action been one between single ships, is perhaps open to criticism. On the other hand, Elliott might well have remembered Nelson's words that a captain could not be very far wrong if he placed his vessel alongside one of the enemy.

At all events, the failure of the *Niagara* and the other vessels behind the *Caledonia* to violate the letter of their instructions came near resulting in a great disaster. The *Lawrence*, supported by the two gunboats, forged considerably ahead of the rest of the American squadron, and thus drew upon herself most of the British fire. To add to the hopelessness of these odds, the wind died down to practically a calm so that Perry failed, after all, to get close enough to use his short-range carronades effec-

¹⁰ *American State Papers, Naval Affairs*, Vol. I, p. 295.

¹¹ Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. II, pp. 76-88; Dawson's *Battles of the United States*, Vol. II, pp. 279, 288; and Cooper's *The Battle of Lake Erie*.

tively. The rear vessels were unable to come to his assistance, and by a little after two o'clock the *Lawrence* was practically a wreck; every brace and bow-line had been shot away; all the guns on the side nearest the enemy had been disabled; and out of about one hundred and forty-two men, thirty-nine of whom were sick and unfit for duty, eighty-three had been killed or wounded. Fortunately for the Americans, however, the *Detroit* had also been badly mauled, chiefly it appears from the fire of the two gunboats, the *Ariel* and the *Scorpion*; Barclay was so badly wounded that he was forced to quit the deck; the *Queen Charlotte's* captain was killed, and her first lieutenant was knocked senseless by a splinter; the *Lady Prevost* fell to leeward with her rudder crippled. Some of this damage was done by the long-range fire of the *Caledonia*, *Niagara*, and the rear gunboats; how much it is impossible to ascertain.¹²

Meanwhile the breeze, which had fallen practically to a calm, freshened a bit; and Elliott, seeing the desperate condition of the *Lawrence*, determined, although he had received no order to that effect, to quit his place in the line and go to her relief. Sailing clear of the *Caledonia*, he passed to windward of the *Lawrence*, bringing the *Niagara* "gallantly into close action", wrote Perry in his report. About the same time Perry, seeing the necessity of some bold action to retrieve the day, called for sailors to man a boat, in which he set out for the *Niagara*. Contrary to the famous pictures which hang in the Ohio capitol and the national capitol at Washington, he seems to have had but four sailors with him, and his thirteen year old brother remained on board the *Lawrence*. Pulling through the battle smoke, he in a few minutes gained the deck of the *Niagara* and took com-

¹² Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. II, pp. 88-92; Dawson's *Battles of the United States*, Vol. II, pp. 281, 282; Richardson's *War of 1812*, p. 191; Barclay's Report in the *Naval Chronicle*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 250-253.

mand, rehoisting his broad pennant and the burgee bearing the words of Lawrence. Immediately after he set foot on board the *Niagara*, the disabled flagship, which had hardly more than a dozen sound men left aboard, surrendered.¹³

As to what happened upon Perry's reaching the deck of the *Niagara*, there is irreconcilable testimony. According to Elliott's partisans, Perry remarked that he feared the day was lost; but Elliott replied that it was not and that if Perry would assume command of the *Niagara*, he would bring the gunboats into close action. Although Perry for some time subsequent to the battle spoke in the highest terms of Elliott, he later charged (1818) that when he came aboard the *Niagara*, "Captain Elliott was keeping her on a course by the wind, which would in five minutes have carried said vessel entirely out of action." The controversy had many points of similarity to that which resulted from the battle of Santiago. There were charges and counter-charges, fierce denunciations, official investigations, and much spilling of ink. The novelist James Fenimore Cooper, himself a naval man and the author of what was long the standard history of the American navy, came forward and wrote a book championing Elliott,¹⁴ while Perry did not lack defenders.¹⁵ Owing to the death of Perry in 1819, the controversy was never fully threshed out before a court-martial.

All that we can be absolutely certain of is that El-

¹³ Clowes's *History of the Royal Navy*, Vol. VI, p. 124; Mahan's *Sea Power in its Relation to the War of 1812*, Vol. II, pp. 88-93; Dawson's *Battles of the United States*, Vol. II, pp. 283-289; Mackenzie's *Life of Perry*, Vol. II, p. 45; and the *Diary of Dr. Usher Parsons in the Publications of the Rhode Island Historical Society*, Vol. VII, p. 244.

¹⁴ Cooper's *The Battle of Lake Erie*. The appendix to Jarvis's *Biographical Notice of Commodore Jesse D. Elliott* contains the proceedings of the court of inquiry which was held at Elliott's request in 1815.

¹⁵ See, for instance, Burges's *Battle of Lake Erie*; Mackenzie's *Life of Perry*; and Documents Relative to the Difference between Commodore Perry and Captain Elliott.

liott did bring up the rear gunboats, while Perry, in the fresh *Niagara*, bore down upon the *Detroit*, supported by the *Ariel*, *Scorpion*, and *Caledonia*, and also by the *Trippe*, which had already passed the other rear vessels of her own accord. The *Niagara* broke the British line in fine style, firing her larboard battery into the *Chippewa*, *Little Belt*, and *Lady Prevost*, and her starboard battery into the *Detroit*, *Queen Charlotte*, and *Hunter*. This maneuver decided the battle. In attempting to wear, the *Detroit* fell foul of the *Queen Charlotte*; and as the two lay thus the *Niagara* raked them fore and aft with terrible effect, then ran astern of the *Lady Prevost*, raked her, and bore off for the *Hunter*. For the first time the whole American fleet was engaged, and the result could no longer be doubtful. About three o'clock the *Hunter*, *Detroit*, *Queen Charlotte*, and *Lady Prevost* surrendered. The *Little Belt* and *Chippewa* attempted to escape, but were overhauled and brought back by the *Scorpion* and *Trippe*. The formalities of surrender were carried out upon the blood-stained deck of the battle-scarred *Lawrence*, over which Perry again raised his flag and from which he sent his laconic message of victory to General Harrison.

The decisive nature of the action and the many dramatic circumstances attending it combined to make Perry's name better known than that of any other American naval commander of his times. Every schoolboy has heard of him if of no other sea captain. Bold, intrepid, a splendid, downright fighter he certainly was, yet in some other qualities that go to make up the truly great leader he seems to have been defective. Of him it has been said that an "officer seldom went into action worse or got out of it better." The statement at least contains a half truth. His failure to foresee the result of the falling of the wind is not strange, and yet it was a mistake which MacDonough of Plattsburg fame would not have been

likely to make. With an equal or perhaps an inferior fleet, MacDonough forced his enemies to fight him in a position where their great superiority in long range guns was lost, and by his foresight in arranging his anchors he was able at the critical moment to turn his flagship, present a fresh broadside, and decide the action. Perry, with a fleet much superior to that of the enemy, came perilously near being defeated, and probably would have been had the British been his equal in strength. His victory as finally won was overwhelming and decisive. It was also brilliant, but it was the brilliancy of the outfielder who misjudges an easy fly ball and retrieves his mistake by a circus catch.

THE ART OF PRESENTATION IN HISTORY TEACHING

By J. R. H. MOORE

In presenting so broad a subject as this, I shall confine myself to its application to high school conditions, for the problems of high school and college history teaching are entirely distinct, and there seems to me to be absolutely no connection between them. Most college instructors in history do not build upon the teaching which their students have had; indeed, I have been told by some of the leaders in college work that they prefer that their students should have had no so-called training in preparatory school history. The reason for this is that in so many schools the training is still confined to stuffing the mind of the child with places and dates; the result bears no more resemblance to the mental training we now think necessary than a heap of bricks bears to a finished house. I may state the purpose of high school history teaching to be a development of certain mental capabilities, depending upon the stage which the child's mind may have reached.

In dealing with this question of presentation, we have just two factors with which we are concerned: these are the child and the teacher. Some of you may object that this leaves out the text-book, and indeed I intended to omit it, for we have left behind us the day when we are afraid to get away from the text-book. There are many books from which to choose, varying much in method and content, but having certain characteristics in common: for example, they are all more or less afflicted with blunders, and are all designed for the average class. We all know that classes differ enormously in character and ability, and

even within the class we have different elements for whose use we have only the one text-book. Hence it becomes a question of handling one source of supply so as to aid in the development of many different stages of the child mind. For this reason, I say, the book is simply the source of supply for the child's original ideas, to be worked over in recitation by teacher and student into something that the children can understand. The valuable part of this process is the "working over". President Hadley once said that the valuable part of the high school work does not consist so much in the work actually done as in the way it is done. The first real factor, then, is the student.

As a rule, the child we deal with in the high school is a freshman. By this I do not mean that he is in his first year, but I refer to a state of mind, a stage of development, a lack of maturity characterized by certain defects or deficiencies. The high school freshman is at the most painful stage of his existence. He has not learned to think, and he does not know how to work. He means to do the right thing and he is very ambitious, but he does not intend the teacher to find out either fact. He is possessed of a large and most heterogeneous mass of misinformation; he can tell you all about what wireless telegraphy is not, but he is sublimely innocent of grammar, and we may feel ourselves lucky if we find that he knows the multiplication table. He is a mass of contradictions, but very positive in all things. He has a strong sense of honor, but it is very tenuous, and too much swayed by circumstances, not as yet having been tempered in the forge of experience.

He takes history for various reasons. Sometimes because he is compelled to; then it becomes a deadly grind for everybody, and only the skillful hand of the careful teacher can rescue him from acute mental anaemia. Sometimes because he does not know what he wants

to do, and he thinks history is easy, so he takes it. Aimlessness ought to be a cardinal sin in a high school. Sometimes he takes it because some older person advises it, seeing the boy's short-comings, realizing that the boy runs a better chance of getting mental growth by application to a humanistic study than if he pores over the hard and fast work of the average high school course in mathematics. With the growth of modern methods in history teaching, this last class will become larger and larger, and we shall accomplish greater good with our application of the subject to the child, and by refraining from trying to make the child fit the subject.

This leaves us to study for a few moments the qualifications of the history teacher. I believe that there are three important traits that the good history teacher must have, and I put them in this order, the most important first: sympathy; power of adaptation; and a knowledge of the subject. This division is made after years of work in supervision of teachers of all sorts in all grades, as well as from my own experience as a teacher. It is just another way of stating the fact that has come to be recognized among us, namely, that the teacher is everything, and the text-book, provided that it is, generally speaking, suited to the local circumstances, counts for little.

By sympathy is meant the ability to see into the child's mind, immature as it is, and to appreciate its actual condition. This is the most important quality for good history teaching; if one is not naturally interested in adolescent psychology, it is a most difficult thing to learn. Without it all teaching must be perfunctory. The child's mind may be well trained in certain ways, he may obtain some little disciplinary advantages, but the higher purpose, the training of the human soul for a brave conflict with the world, is totally lacking. The first study of the teacher should be the class, not the subject. A teacher

must therefore have as many preparations as she has classes, for the different sections will handle the same substance according to their several capacities, and the teacher must stand ready to utilize the material brought in by the children according to the powers of assimilation possessed by the class. Last week a superintendent of schools was telling me his troubles. Last year, he, with many others of his class, had contested for a teacher who had just left the graduate school of a large university with a most remarkable record for scholarship. He had thought himself very lucky in obtaining her services, but after a few weeks he discovered that she was an entire failure as a teacher. She expected the children to come up to her level, and she failed them if they didn't. On top of this, she blamed the trouble on to the other teachers in the school. She simply oppressed her students with the burden of her knowledge, and of course none of them could compete with her in her own field. Now the superintendent is anxious to find her a good place elsewhere.

Most of the children we deal with are in the adolescent stage, and are not normal in the sense in which we use the word regarding adults. It is difficult for most of us to read each other's minds, for the drift of modern training is to make the face the mask of the mind; we pit ourselves against this problem, and are sometimes able to fathom each other's thoughts. But no one can easily fathom the child; his mental action does not follow accepted rules. No man can tell what the child will think of, or how he will think it. By the very difficulty of the problem we are shown the extreme necessity of finding a rational solution. It is a rule with me that a teacher who has never gotten into sympathy with her classes has failed of the best results, while one who has lost sympathy has passed the point of usefulness.

In exercising the power of adaptation the problem

is simply this, how to connect the boy and the book intelligently. Knowing the mental condition of the boy, and knowing the material to which he may have access, how shall the teacher see to it that the boy gets the greatest possible amount of good out of the time spent? The answer to this question is found in the fact that the recitation is the most important part of the child's school experience. In this time he must learn how to digest mentally the raw material which he gets outside. In this process the teacher must play an important part, leading the children where they need it, following them where they are able to lead. As the physician keeps his finger on the pulse, so the teacher must know when to step in with the remedy, when to let well enough alone. The object is not to make the child recite the lesson and let it go at that, but to bring out the facts of the lesson story so that all the members of the class get the thought and are able to express it in terms of their own thoughts, on paper or orally. I believe that written recitations are just as important as spoken ones, though the art of doing it is not so easy. The slow child, the timid child, the child who lacks imagination, all ages to be "got at", what can be more fascinating than this puzzle?

I put a knowledge of the subject last, because I believe that no matter how well prepared to teach a person may be, if he lacks sympathy, and the power of adapting himself and his material to the class in question, all his scholarship goes for naught and is worse than naught. Most people who aspire to teach history in high schools know enough to carry them through. The question with them is to use wisely what they do know, getting other material from experience. The great majority of us know too much to make good teachers. To be sure, it is not always our own fault that we do not succeed. We may be obliged by others to cover so much ground in a short time, and so be forced to pick and choose our way through four

times the material the children can possibly use. Here we must trust that we may select such things as will meet the approval of others. Some day we shall get text-books so written that we do not "have to finish the book", but may do as much as the classes can do to the best advantage. Sometimes we are obliged to work under others who do not know anything about the teaching of history, following their directions as well as we can. I once corrected a paper written by a woman who was to obtain a principal's license, who did not know what Mason and Dixon's line was! Yet I suppose she is somewhere to-day, supervising the work of some innocent history teacher who is trying to make men and women out of her raw material. I do not suppose her ignorance really made much difference, provided she has the right ideas about teaching, but I should be very much afraid that such ignorance as that was more than skin deep. You may have heard the story about the superintendent who was looking for a teacher of history. He had many candidates, and of each he asked the same question, "What can *you* teach?" The candidate promptly responded that she could teach all the history there was, ending with a statement of all the courses she had taken and all the classes she had taught. After such responses from many successive applicants, he at last found one woman who said that *she* could teach children. She got the job.

Friends, let me beg of you, be first of all friends to the children. Live with them as far as lies in you — certainly so far as their mental life is concerned — find out where they are, help them to rise as fast as they may, and give them such a mental training in your history recitations that when they leave you they shall be clear-headed citizens, able to keep their heads in a presidential campaign, and to settle wisely the simple but vital problems that must be decided by leaders of men.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE FEDERATION OF HISTORICAL TEACHERS' ASSOCIATIONS

BY CARL E. PRAY

America is now and always has been obsessed to a very large degree with the idea that the "practical", always meaning whatever is connected with money-making, is the one thing that deserves the attention of the man of brains and energy. The ideal man to whom each community points as the one to be emulated by the young men is the man who is able to handle the largest business enterprises the most successfully.

For many years our educational institutions were not interfered with by the "practical" men because they did not believe that there was any relation between education and business efficiency, anyway, and since there was no money in education they paid little attention to it. When modern science began to attract attention as an educational movement, it could be shown that there is a direct relation between scientific instruction and making a living, and in consequence the science departments at once gained the attention of business men, and because there was money in it, the science departments have secured all the money they have wanted for laboratories and equipment, or at least their demands have been satisfied first of all, while the other departments of school work have had to be content with what was left after the demands of science have been satisfied.

This has not been true because the results of scientific teaching have actually given students the ability to earn a living. The teachers of science have held that motive before the business man while they have cowered

before the educational world's demand for mental discipline and have organized their courses to meet the ages old requirement that school studies should be primarily for intellectual training.

Now comes industrial training which the school men are putting up before the "practical" men in answer to their demands that the schools turn their attention directly to the matter of showing boys and girls how to make a living. The whole thought of the school world is turned towards this one goal; the money, the energy, the political support that the superintendents need, all demand that they be focused for a term of years upon this one field while the rest of the educational domain will receive only incidental attention. I am well aware that this will not be true of higher education, but it is and will be most emphatically true of the public schools.

To all this movement towards trade schools, agricultural schools, and hand work in the lower grades, I do not in any way take exception. I have written, spoken, and argued in favor of them all, but I do wish to call the attention of this Association most decidedly to the state of affairs and to call upon its members to be alive to the situation. There are other things in the curriculum that demand attention besides science and industrial education. Our attention need be turned toward but one of these activities since there are others to look after the interests of the other lines of educational work.

What shall it profit this country of ours if it trains men and women to a high degree of economic efficiency and loses its ideals of patriotism and of self-government? A nation without traditions of which it is justly proud, without education in those traditions that it may fully understand them and profit by them, without a clear conception of the needs and ideals of the nation as a whole, is a nation without a soul and devoid of understanding. Such a nation we will become in an increasing degree if

our schools are to be devoted mainly to training children in making a living. The logical result of the present "practical" tendency in education would be to relegate to the rubbish heap all subjects not primarily industrial — with the exception of reading, writing, and arithmetic, which even the most "practical" business man can see are necessary.

In the past there has been time for political training through the direct experience of the individual citizen. Political problems have been simple and the people have gone on the principle that if each section looked out for its own interests the combination of interests would check each other in such a way that a general average of equitable legislation and enforcement of law would result. However this plan has worked in the past, it can no longer answer the needs of the country. Legislation has come to be a specialized calling, and the enforcement of law and its interpretation have fallen into the hands of a distinct class. Conditions have become so complex that it is no longer possible for the average citizen to understand even the terminology of legislation to say nothing of the machinery of government and the complicated issues involved, without special study. Legislative bureaus are being established to frame laws and to advise legislators in the individual States, and special bodies of trained men are being empowered to direct the action of these laws and apply them. At the same time the individual citizen has far less time to devote to his public duties than formerly, and prominent men are frankly declaring that the people are not to be trusted with the direct settlement of governmental issues. The day of competition has arrived in America and we are beginning to experience the problems and difficulties that European writers have always prophesied we would meet as soon as our country was fully settled. The real test of our institutions is about to be applied, and I am convinced that the time has come for

a campaign for far more intensive study and a far more wide-spread knowledge of our institutions and their history by the masses of the people than has ever been true in the past.

This will necessitate not only much more comprehensive courses in the schools, public and private, but a systematic effort on the part of historical and political science societies and public-spirited citizens in general to educate the great masses of mature citizens who are through school, who have never been instructed in the ideals and history of our institutions, and who are in consequence at the mercy of the scheming demagogue or the wily political boss, while through their ignorance and susceptibility the country is switched back and forth from one extreme to another with resulting unrest and dissatisfaction and our very institutions are endangered.

While the demagogue and the boss are working night and day the historical associations proceed calmly on their way in academic serenity, almost unconscious of the critical period through which we are passing, but fifty years from now when it is all settled one way or another, they will right gladly and with scientific carefulness and impartiality sift and weigh the evidence and inform posterity how it all happened.

I wish to propose a national Federation of History Teachers' Associations with the distinct purpose of conducting a campaign for popularizing the study of American history and institutions among the people themselves; for improving the teaching of history in our public schools by creating a demand for better trained teachers of history and government and a demand for more adequate courses in these subjects; for spreading at once the departmental system in all our public schools throughout at least the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, so that a well prepared teacher of history may have an opportunity of developing his subject as it should be developed to

obtain desirable results; for a campaign of enlightenment that the people may know that the evils arising from ignorance of our experience as a nation in the past and of the working of our institutions may be even more overwhelming in the end than the lack of skilled workmen in the trades, and that there is no reason why we should suffer from either disaster if we meet the situation with our best efforts; for unifying and stimulating the work of our local associations that programs may not be duplicated or repeated to too great an extent and for informing the weakest and slowest association of the work of the best so that all may be stimulated.

There are many other direct problems that such an organization could and would undertake to solve, not all at once nor with the idea of making everything right in a fortnight but as opportunity offered and as the interests and abilities of the organization developed.

We have now a national organ through which a national organization may act and extend the results of its work broadcast throughout the country. I refer to the *History Teacher's Magazine*. Never before has it been possible to bring our associations together by a common bond of information concerning the activities of the different history teachers' associations, and I believe that one of the activities of a national organization should be the active support of this magazine until every member of every history teachers' association in the country is a subscriber to it. The *History Teacher's Magazine* can only thrive through the support of every history teacher, and the associations can never do their work effectively without such an organ as this magazine.

A committee was appointed by the History Teachers' Section of the American Historical Association at the Buffalo meeting to attempt a national organization of some sort, or national coöperation at least. Can not the purpose of this committee be best carried out by the ap-

pointment of a member from each association to represent the needs and ideas of each organization and to cooperate with the central committee in suggesting programs for teachers' meetings and to assist in getting the civic organizations of the cities to invite representative teachers of history and civics to address them on the need of more and better history and government instruction, incidentally instructing these same civic organizations, the members of which are always alive to any suggestion that is worth while?

I believe that never before were the people so alive to impressions concerning good government and good citizenship as now. If we come before them with a message, they will hear us. If we are downright in earnest and we ourselves see clearly the benefits of a thorough understanding of American ideals of government and progress, there can be no question but that our influence will be a material addition to those other influences that are shaping American life and thought.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE CERTIFICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS OF HISTORY

BY FREDERIC L. PAXSON

The Committee on the Certification of High School Teachers of History was appointed in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at its Evanston meeting in 1911. As organized by President McLaughlin, the Committee consists of the following members: Mr. F. M. Anderson, Mr. E. C. Barker, Mr. G. L. Jones, Mr. L. M. Larson, Mr. O. G. Libby, Mr. St. George L. Sioussat, Mr. J. W. Townsend, Mr. J. Viles, Mr. W. C. Wilcox, Mr. J. F. Willard, Mr. J. A. Woodburn, and Mr. F. L. Paxson, chairman. These members have been in active correspondence among themselves and with the chairman of the Committee during the past year. It has not been possible for them to meet as a body, but there have been a number of personal conferences. As the result of a year's work, the Committee now has before it its problem clearly defined and ready to be considered point by point.

From the beginning it was apparent to the Committee that there are three classes of teachers of history in the high schools. These are (1) those whose preparation includes a standard college course; (2) those who have had something less than the training of the ordinary bachelor and have received it at normal schools, summer schools, or in irregular fashion; and (3) those who having completed a college course have taken one or more years of specialized instruction in the historical field. After considerable correspondence relating to these three

classes, the Committee decided to confine its attention to the class first mentioned: those persons who are to receive the bachelor's degree. Although these do not include all the existing teachers of history, it was felt that the Association ought not to countenance the appointment in high schools of persons whose preparation has fallen below that of the regular college course. On the other hand, while the Committee would be glad to see the requirement for the history teacher raised so as to include graduate preparation, it believes that this ideal is of the future and does not call for immediate consideration at this time. Accordingly, the Committee has devoted its time to a study of the problem involved in preparing the college graduate who proposes to teach history in the high schools.

In considering the college course with reference to the needs of the teacher of history, the first question has to do with the proportion of the undergraduate work to be allotted to the department of history. The standard college course consists of about one hundred and twenty semester hours or credits. These credits are variously described in different institutions, but, in general, most institutions approximate this amount of work. Whether history when taken for professional preparation should include twenty or forty or even sixty per cent of these one hundred and twenty credit hours, is the fundamental problem, and our Committee, through a sub-committee, is now devoting its attention to the question. A second question, important though less fundamental, relates to the percentage of hours to be allotted to collateral subjects including political economy, political science, and sociology. It is the belief of the Committee that the course ought to include work in these fields, in addition to the work in history. The amount of work that ought to be taken in these fields is under consideration in a second sub-committee.

Having determined the number of hours of history

which ought to be required in the standard college course, it becomes necessary to determine the distribution of those hours among elementary and advanced courses. It is usually the custom to begin college history with an elementary survey course which is variously placed in the fields of general European history, English history, ancient history, or American history. These courses appear to be conducted with reference to general training and to method of study. The question has arisen as to whether the prospective teacher ought to be required to cover the ground of all of the four high school units in elementary courses, or whether his time will be better spent under a different arrangement. The possibilities with reference to survey courses seem to be limited to three. The student may be required to cover the whole field in four courses of, say, six credit hours each, thus devoting a minimum of twenty-four one hundred twentieths of his college work to elementary courses. Or, secondly, he may be required to cover, say, two of the six credit courses with an expenditure of twelve one hundred twentieths, and may thus be allowed to devote the surplus of his time to advanced specialized work in some limited fields of history. The Committee has been much impressed by the problem of intellectual discipline and historical equipment raised at this point, and no decision has yet been reached. A third possibility is the creation of a special course for teachers. Such a course might well cover two years and involve twelve units of work. In this course the whole field of high school history might be covered. The answer to the question as to the distribution of the hours allotted to history is likely to be in the direction of one of the three courses just suggested. As to which one, it is too early to make a prophecy; but the Committee is confident that it has taken a long step towards the solution of the problem in having analyzed it clearly and concretely.

A portion of the undergraduate training in history will certainly be allotted to advanced courses covering limited periods in which the student shall have a chance to acquire an intimate knowledge of the historic mind and historical procedure. How much time shall be given to these courses necessarily depends upon the answer to the last question. How these courses shall be arranged, how they shall be conducted, needs careful consideration, which is being given to it by a sub-committee.

There is still a third type of course, which has been brought to the attention of the Committee, and upon which investigations are being made. A course in the methods of teaching history is now given in several of the larger universities, sometimes within the department of education or pedagogy. There appears to be a nearly unanimous opinion that such a course ought to be included in the requirements for our history teacher. We have not yet decided whether it ought to be given as history or as education; but we are facing the problem. Still more important, we are endeavoring to find out what the content of this course ought to be, and what amount of time it ought to occupy. There are some members of the Committee who would be glad to see, in addition to a course in methods of teaching history, a course in methods of historical research. No one has asked that a graduate seminary be included in the undergraduate requirements, and there is no intention of recommending that undergraduates be required to specialize in historical production. But whether the undergraduate should be allowed to go out to teach without having some understanding of the problems which the historical investigator must solve has been raised within the Committee. It is too early to anticipate its answer.

With several sub-committees working upon different phases of the main problem, your Committee is able to report progress and to suggest its willingness to continue

the investigation, if such course should meet with the approval of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

The Committee recognizes that any definition of the proper college course for history teachers is only a preliminary step toward a correct solution of the problem. College faculties will have to be confronted, educated, and persuaded to revise their requirements before any such course can be made operative. Even after the college faculties have been brought into line, and this will unquestionably be a serious matter in those colleges whose equipment is meager and whose instructors are already working over time, it will be necessary to convince the appointing authorities (superintendents or school boards) that no teacher of history ought to be employed unless he has been trained to teach history. And unless it shall prove that there is a proper and direct professional training for the history teacher, we can never hope to induce the appointing authorities to recognize the training.

DISCUSSION

BY SAMUEL B. HARDING

Professor Samuel B. Harding of Indiana University opened the discussion of the morning. He heartily indorsed Professor Pray's proposal of a Federation of History Teachers' Associations, and emphasized the impossibility of many high school teachers attending the meetings of the American Historical Association, and the danger of the local associations working in isolation and in ignorance each of what the others are doing. Such a committee or council as is proposed would serve as a clearing house between the different associations, and would make for united action in dealing with the problems of the course of study, methods and the like.

The proposals of the Committee on the Certification of History Teachers he thought too inchoate as yet to admit of extended discussion. The need of training in the subject matter of history for history teachers was one which should be emphasized, for too often school officials were under the sway of the old idea that "anyone can teach history". He thought that the teacher's training should consist in part of comprehensive courses in several of the different fields taught in the high school, together with some more intensive study of at least a few periods. Personally he had great faith in the value of a brief course in methods of historical research and criticism, as a means of clarifying the prospective teacher's attitude toward the whole subject. Such a course had worked well in Indiana University, as had also a course in the theory and practice of history teaching which was given under the joint supervision of the department of history and the school of education.

979

M7

V2 p

UNIV. OF MICHIGAN

JAN 30 1913

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
FOR THE YEAR
1911-1912